DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 014 UD 017 310

AUTHOR	Collister, Larry
TITLE	A Narrative Account of the Development of Desegregation Goals for the Seattle School District, 1970-1975.
INSTITUTION	Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
REPORT NO	75-29
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement; Community Planning; Educational Policy; *Historical Reviews; *Integration Plans; Policy Formation; *Public Schools; *School Districts; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS	Seattle Public Schools WA; *Washington (Seattle)

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a narrative account of desegregation goals for the Seattle school district for the period dating from 1970-1975. During this time, major policy decisions were made by the school board establishing district policy on desegregation. The Citizens Committee for Quality Education played a primary role in developing recommendations which the board used in adopting its original goals in 1970. There was an important response from Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. The Citizens Advisory Councils were important in the development of district policy, although no single advisory council offered a plan which prevailed at the end. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145014

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Larry Collister
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESEGREGATION GOALS FOR THE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1970-1975

REPORT NO. 75-29
DECEMBER, 1975

LARRY COLLISTER

UD017310

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION
Robert Nelson
Assistant Superintendent

DEPARTMENT OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY
Mary R. Carson, Director

Prepared by:	Approved by:
Larry Collister	Mary R. Carson
Larry Collister Research Assistant	Mary R. Carson Director

ABSTRACT

In the interval 1970-1975, major policy decisions taken by the School Board establishing District policy on desegregation were the following:

1. November 11, 1970. The Board adopted goals to desegregate the schools.
2. January 27, 1971. The Board implemented its plan to establish multi-racial middle schools.
3. February, 1972. The Board accepted a variety of desegregation plans developed by area citizens' councils and by a District Desegregation Task Force.
4. April 12, 1972. The Board declined to rescind its previous actions of November 1970, and January 1971.
5. April 11, 1973. The Board established the basis for the District's application for Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Title VII funding to support desegregation efforts.
6. June 12, 1974. The Board adopted a plan to desegregate Garfield High School.

The Citizens Committee for Quality Education played a primary role in developing recommendations which the Board used in adopting its original goals in 1970. There was an important response from Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. The Citizens Advisory Councils were important in the development of District policy, although no single advisory council offered a plan which prevailed at the end. The Nixon administration's stand on bussing had an effect on local opinion, as did disturbances at Eckstein and Lincoln. A number of side issues such as free lunches, alternative schools, and child care centers, and the availability of narcotics to school students, tended to cloud the issues in public discussion.

The narrative summarizes the development of District desegregation goals, and ends with a current status report. Appendices contain texts of significant Board resolutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

PRELIMINARY EFFORTS. 1

CONTRIBUTORY THEMES. 2

NARRATIVE OF EVENTS. 3

OTHER COURT ACTIONS. 14

TITLE VII FUNDING CONTROVERSY. 27

APPENDICES 29

NOTES. 35

A NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESEGREGATION GOALS FOR THE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1970-1975

Sixteen years after Brown v. Board of Education, the Seattle School Board announced formally its intent to end de facto segregation in the Seattle Schools. The purpose of this paper is to give an accounting of the development of the District's desegregation goals in the subsequent five-year period to assist District administrators, Board members, and citizens in assessing the past and to clarify further discussion. The paper is primarily a narrative of events reported in the two leading Seattle newspapers over the period 1970-1975, as they relate to the development of District policy on desegregation.

Preliminary Efforts, 1947-1970.

The Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning (February, 1972) listed a series of Board actions[1] beginning in 1947 with a policy of hiring teachers of different races. Other key actions in the development of the District's desegregation effort prior to 1970 were:

1. Formation of a Voluntary Racial Transfer Program (1963).

2. Appointment of a lay citizens' group to study the complex factors facing the school system and alleviating de facto segregation and solving related problems of children from limited cultural background (1963). The committee's recommendations (1965) have stimulated the preparation and distribution of a comprehensive statement of School District programs and policies with special reference to services for students with culturally different backgrounds and reaffirmation of a commitment to the basic philosophy of providing equal educational opportunities by elimination of racial segregation and achievement of integrated education.

3. Appointment of the Seattle Citizens' School Progress Planning Committee of 100 (1966), to examine a continuous progress center concept. The Committee recommended that quality education in an integrated environment could best be accomplished through development of continuous progress learning centers.

4. Establishment of the Southeast Education Center (1967) to plan and develop learning centers designed to facilitate quality integrated education.

5. Approval (1968) of additional planning for desegregated middle schools and direction to the administration to plan for transition of junior high students to multi-racial middle schools (one by September, 1969, and at least three by September, 1971).

6. Approval of the educational plan of the Central Region (1969) for the formation of eight satellite preschools, an early childhood education center, seven K-4 primary schools, two K-6 schools, one 5-8 middle school, and one 9-12 high school for purposes of providing quality education and racial integration.

A series of efforts, less visible and formal, had been initiated during the last several years to assure continued progress toward achieving quality integrated education for children. For example, a systematic effort was made to recruit classified and certificated minority staff members; special programs were developed to upgrade the performance and skills of all students, but especially of the minority and disadvantaged student; community, intergroup, special education, and other educational specialists were hired and assigned to work with parents, staff and students; educational facilities were planned and developed to support the new programs; and changes in administrative policy were made so that principals, teachers, students, and parents would have more freedom to plan and develop programs for their schools.

Contributory Themes, 1970-1975.

Several themes are developed in the narrative that follows, and taken together, they explain the present stance of the Seattle School District with respect to School desegregation. The major policy decisions taken by the Board were the following:

1. November 11, 1970. The Board adopted goals to desegregate the schools.

2. January 27, 1971. The Board implemented its plan to establish multi-racial middle schools.

3. February, 1972. The Board accepted a variety of desegregation plans developed by area citizens' councils and by a District Desegregation Task Force.

4. April 12, 1972. The Board declined to rescind its previous actions of November, 1970 and January, 1971.

5. April 11, 1973. The Board adopted a timeline for the continuation of its desegregation efforts, establishing the basis for the District's application for Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Title VII funding to support desegregation efforts.

6. June 12, 1974. The Board adopted a plan to desegregate Garfield High School.

An examination of newspaper accounts and of School Board minutes during the period 1970-1975 has indicated the existence of contributory and sometimes conflicting themes in the development of desegregation policy for the Seattle School District.

The Citizens Committee for Quality Education played a primary role in developing recommendations based on citizen input which the Board used in adopting its original goals in 1970. There was an important response from Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. This response took the form of a court injunction, a movement to recall members of the Board, an attempt to remove Superintendent Forbes Bottomly, and an attempt to replace Board members in regular school elections. The Citizens Advisory Councils were important in the development of District policy, although no single advisory council offered a plan which prevailed at the end. The Nixon administration's stand on bussing also had an effect on local opinion. Disturbances at Eckstein and at Lincoln High School influenced public opinion in a significant measure. In addition, there were a number of side issues not directly related to the question of desegregation, but which, nevertheless, influenced people's thinking. Some of these were the question of religion in the schools, free lunches, alternative schools, child care centers, and the availability of narcotics to school students. Opinion on these issues was divided and discussion of these questions tended to become mixed with the broader question of desegregation within the schools.

The remainder of the paper is an account of related events occurring between November, 1970 and November, 1975.

Narrative of Events

Board Adopts Goals. At the special School Board meeting of November 11, 1970, Mrs. Forrest S. Smith, Vice President of the Seattle School Board, read a prepared statement which enunciated the major goals of the Seattle School District with respect to desegregation. She said:

> "The time has come for the next major step forward. Fulfilling a goal established in 1968, we will, in September, 1971, establish a number of multi-racial middle schools that will be the forerunners of comparable 5th through 8th grade programs for all Seattle students at those grade levels.
>
> "Nor does our long-range goal rest there. Beyond the gradual development of multi-racial middle schools we look to the integration of the educational experience for all Seattle students from kindergarten through 12th grade. We earnestly invite the community to join with us in conceiving how that goal shall be attained."[2]

The plan adopted by the Board in November, 1970, called for actions in September, 1971, which would:

a) Desegregate the Meany-Madrona Middle School and

b) Establish multi-racial middle schools in both the Roosevelt and Lincoln attendance areas.

This entailed the movement of approximately 600 students from the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas to middle schools in the Central Area and movement in the other direction of approximately 600 middle school-age students then enrolled in Central Area schools. The Board's intention would have resulted, in the Fall of 1971, in middle school components for 5th and 6th graders at four locations in the Roosevelt-Lincoln area and middle school components for 7th and 8th graders within existing facilities at Wilson, Hamilton, Marshall, and Eckstein Junior High Schools.

The Board invited citizen involvement in developing alternative, workable plans for the first phase of the desegregation program. Plans being initiated by the public were to meet the following criteria:

1. Student population involved would be at the 5th and 8th grade levels.
2. The attendance areas involved would be Lincoln, Roosevelt and Garfield areas.
3. The result would be to desegregate the Meany-Madrona Middle School by September, 1971.
4. The non-white pupil population in each middle school component would range from 15% to 40%.
5. There would be provisions for major community involvement in planning of program, pupil services, and school-parent relations.
6. There would be provisions for educational programs of high quality for all participating students.

The Board's statement emphasized the need for citizen participation beyond the projected implementation date of September, 1971. The Board asked for citizen input to advise them, not only with respect to further steps in multi-racial middle schools throughout the District, but also regarding the measures needed to bring about integration of the other grade levels.

The minutes of November 11, 1970, indicate that Board Member Swain moved the adoption of the statement read by Mrs. Smith as the plan to implement desegregation in the Seattle School District beginning with the 1971-72 school year. When the vote was called, the Board unanimously joined to support the new position on desegregation.

Citizen input. Two organizations were formed by citizens in response to the Board action. One was the Citizens Committee for Quality Education, a self-constituted group of broad citizen interest. The group sought and received School Board sanction to develop recommendations for implementation of Board policy on integration of Seattle Public Schools.

A second group, Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing, appeared and filed in the Superior Court an appeal against the November 11th desegregation decision of the Seattle School Board. They requested the Superior Court specifically to issue an injunction against the School Board enjoining it from implementing its plan to desegregate the schools. The Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing further petitioned the Superior Court for a writ of mandamus to enforce the county election officials to prepare a ballot synopsis for the recall of the Seattle School Board members.[3] An affidavit submitted with the petition stated that the petitioners believed that the Board would embark on a cross-town bussing program under the guise of desegregating the schools, while its true goal, it was stated, was to impose the 4-4-4 plan or middle school plan without informing citizens "until it was too late."

The affidavit charged that the Board intentionally increased the racial imbalance of Meany-Madrona to justify the "desegregation guise leading to middle schools." When it filed the recall charges, the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing (CAMB) also asked for the dismissal of Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent. An an appointed official, Dr. Bottomly was not subject to recall, but could be removed only by the action of the School Board.

Superior Court Judge Stanley C. Soderland ruled that none of the seven misconduct charges against members of the Seattle School Board constituted grounds for recall action.[4] Judge Soderland denied the writ sought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing to force county officials to prepare the charges in a synopsis for recall petitions. Judge Soderland prefaced his ruling by pointing out that elected officials need not account to the voters in a recall election "for each and every policy decision."

Board implements plan. At the Board meeting of January 27, 1971, Board President Smith read a statement[5] entitled "Desegregation of the Seattle Public Schools: The Position of the Seattle School Board." The Board's statement summarized previous actions of the Board, including its decision of November 11, 1970. The statement continued:

> "Following this decision, many citizens of the community stepped forward with support and encouragement. There were others, however, who stated their disagreement in the strongest terms.
>
> "In this setting, the Board appealed to the rational judgment of the citizens for counsel and guidance."

The Board acknowledged many individual plans that had been submitted by citizens' groups, and turned its attention to the major reports submitted by the Citizens Committee for Quality Education (CCQE).

The next major policy statement was made on January 27, 1971, when the School Board set forth these goals for desegregation:

> "The members of the Seattle School Board are fully committed to the proposition that racial segregation in any community is contrary to the basic principles of our society and detrimental to its well-being and that its total elimination must require a continuous effort, employing all of the resources of the community.

> The Board believes further that integrated education will provide better racial understanding among all children and that the responsibility for providing integrated education rests finally with the Board itself.
>
> The Board endorses these propositions and accepts full responsibility for bringing them squarely before the Seattle citizens. The Board recognizes the political implications of the decisions it has made. It understands but does not concur with those who reject the integration goals and the propositions upon which they are founded.
>
> The Seattle School Board will not deviate from its goal for integration of all Seattle schools at the earliest feasible date. It believes that the time has come for all Seattle citizens to join with the Board to expunge from our schools all vestiges of segregation."

In establishing guidelines for the implementation of its goals, the Board stated the following:

> "To achieve desegregation, the School Board has established a racial balance goal of not less than 15% nor more than 25% of any ethnic minority student population in any school. To accomplish this, approximately 1,200 students will be transported with about 600 Central Region students in grades 5-8 assigned to Lincoln-Roosevelt area schools and about the same number of Lincoln-Roosevelt area students to Meany-Madrona."

The Board further urged that parents and teachers of primary schools of the two regions would pair up to establish voluntary exchanges and other procedures under which children and adults would benefit from educational and human relations experiences. The administration was instructed to recommend elementary schools which would be so paired. The School Board accepted the recommendations of the Citizens Committee for Quality Education on curriculum and directed the administration to provide continuous progress education for the schools. It also directed that multi-ethnic education would be a part of the entire curriculum District-wide and that this would be reflected in the textbooks, readers and other resources used in the schools.

The Board also recognized that staffing of the integrated schools must receive careful attention. Therefore, the Board directed the administration to assign to those schools, principals, teachers and other staff who possessed the educational and human relations leadership qualities which would be required. The administration was also directed to assure that the teaching faculties of those schools would be made up of individuals who desired to work in an integrated school and who would take part in programs of training, individualized instruction, continuous progress and multi-ethnic education. All staff members were instructed to take part in human relations programs to insure that all children would be welcomed and educated without prejudice.

The administration was asked to assign a sufficient number of minority personnel to the administrative, counseling, and teaching staffs of each of the schools in order to provide a meaningful balance. The Board recognized that community involvement is a necessary part of the planning process. To obtain this, the administration was directed to establish a steering committee made up of representatives of the Central Area School Council and of the recognized interim advisory councils of the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas pending formation of elected councils in those two areas. The Board directed the administration to keep in close communication with the Citizens Committee for Quality Education, as that committee developed recommendations for subsequent steps. Referring to the plan to establish multi-racial middle schools as "Phase I" of the desegregation plan, the Board stated at its meeting of January 27, 1971:

> "The School Board realizes that the Phase I program is only a first step toward attaining the goal of integrated education for all children. It therefore directs the administration to continue planning for subsequent phases which will reach that goal. ...It is the Board's goal to have eliminated racial segregation in the Lincoln-Roosevelt-Garfield areas of Seattle Public Schools by September, 1972, and de facto segregation throughout the district by 1973."

On January 27, 1971, the Board implemented its desegregation policy by adopting *Resolution 1971-3 Concerning Desegregation and Integration of Seattle School District No. 1*. The Resolution, contained in Appendix A of this report, p. 29, provided for the exchange of students at the middle school level between the Lincoln-Roosevelt area and the Meany-Madrona area. It provided that continuous progress education should be a part of the curriculum for the middle schools. The resolution addressed the problem of staffing the middle schools, and provided for a planning steering committee. In answering questions from the public, the Board indicated it would finance transportation of students required in the plan with state funding as other transportation of students previously had been done. Students would be assigned to schools, and would not be accepted except at the schools to which they were assigned.

CCQE Report: *June, 1971*. The report of the Citizens Committee for Quality Education of June, 1971, developed recommendations for the cultural and structural integration of the Seattle Public Schools.[6] This report was presented to the School Board at its meeting of July 22, 1971. A minority report was filed along with the majority report. The minority report contained the statement that "the School Board should recognize the imbalance of CCQE membership. This caused many members of the community, and organizations, to feel a sense of futility, and they dropped out feeling their efforts would not be needed."

The minority report stated the hope that the committee would not have spent seven months of long meetings only to have their report ignored. The report, addressed to the question of desegregation, nevertheless suggested that it was inconsistent to assign pupils mandatorily for desegregation while students would be allowed to move to alternative schools, such as Nova, Free School, etc. Objections were entered in the minority report to the concept of continuous progress and individualized instruction. The minority report stated "It is to be noted by the Board the number of individuals signing or supporting the minority report were elected to citizens advisory councils. On the other hand, it must be noted that many of those writing the majority report are not elected, but supposedly represent organizations and yet have consistently spoken strictly for themselves."

Cultural and structural integration. Of far reaching importance were two concepts identified in the CCQE report of June, 1971. These were the ideas of cultural and structural integration. Cultural integration refers to a situation in a school in which all staff and students acquire an understanding and respect for the history, cultural heritage and contributions of all ethnic groups so that there is mutual respect and cultural sharing. A culturally integrated school is one in which children of all ethnic groups not only have an equal opportunity to acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors necessary to be effective persons but are, in fact, demonstrating these characteristics. Structural integration refers to a situation in a school in which the staff members, students and parents of all ethnic groups hold statuses and roles in the social structure of the school which are equivalent to those statuses occupied by members of other ethnic groups.

Citizens' councils. The Central Area School Council was formed after talks between Central Area citizens and the Seattle School Board. These discussions, which began in 1968, led to a document described as "Agreements and understandings reached between representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee on Central Area education and the Seattle School District." The agreements provided for the election of the Central Area School Council, and established formal relationships of the Council to the School Board, to the Superintendent of Schools, area administrators, the community, teachers, and students. The first Council was elected in April, 1969.

In April, 1971, the Superintendent established Guidelines for Citizens School Advisory Councils. The Guidelines specifically include the Central Area School Advisory Council as a recognized and duly-elected Council. Councils were formed for each of the high school attendance areas.

Court injunction. Superior Court Judge William J. Wilkins later enjoined the Seattle School Board from proceeding with its desegregation program for one year. The injunction was handed down on August 10, 1971.[7] The decision also enjoined the Board from bussing involuntarily any child to a school other than to his neighborhood school or the one he had been attending during the previous school year. Judge Wilkins agreed with the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing that the School Board was arbitrary in the way it arrived at the desegregation plan announced November, 1970. The School District announced that it would appeal the decision to the State Supreme Court. At that point all of the schools had been restaffed for the desegregation plan. New principals had been named for the middle schools. Hundreds of hours of teacher workshops, voluntary summer schools and summer camps, parent human relations training and other work had been financed during the summer, financed by about $750,000 in federal money.[8]

Bussing - a national issue. On August 11, 1971, the Associated Press carried a story which indicated the extent of federal involvement in the bussing question.

> "The White House said today that President Nixon has directed federal agencies within the past month to seek school desegregation without bussing and indicated that heads will fall if its desires are ignored.
>
> Ronald L. Ziegler, Press Secretary, told reporters that in the past there have been times when members of the Federal bureaucracy have not been responsive to White House views. 'They're going to be responsive,' he said, 'and those who are not responsive will find themselves involved in other assignments or quite possibly an assignment other than the Federal government.'
>
> Mr. Nixon insisted that school desegregation be carried out wherever possible without bussing youngsters for long distances from their homes. The United States Supreme Court, however, has ruled that bussing is legal.
>
> Governor George Wallace of Alabama sent a telegram to the President yesterday saying Mr. Nixon should support its ban against bussing by asking Federal Courts to reverse themselves and hold it unconstitutional."[9]

Other newspaper accounts [10] indicated a division of public opinion on the question of free school lunches, one of many issues that became entangled in the desegregation question.

The Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing endorsed three candidates[11] for the School Board election. The action was taken in September, 1971. Delwin Chafe and Allan Anderson were among those endorsed by CAMB; Chafe was subsequently elected to the Board.

Problems at Garfield High School. The Central Area School Council was told in late August that school officials may be compounding the problem of declining enrollment at Garfield High School and intensifying suspicion that school may be closed--by refusing to build a learning resource center there. The refusal to build a resource center was one component of a vicious circle which, it was said, was draining Garfield of students. Dr. Roland N. Patterson, Central Region Assistant Superintendent, cited loopholes in regulations allowing transfers out of Garfield as one problem. One such loophole, he said, was a regulation allowing a student to transfer to another school if the course he wanted to take was not offered at his own school. The Council also expressed concern that small numbers of Central Area black students transferring into north end middle schools under the voluntary bussing program would cause the transferring blacks to "lose identity." Before the School Board's mandatory bussing plan was stopped (by court injunction) the Central Area School Council requested a 40% black enrollment in integrated schools. The Citizens Committee for Quality Education, advising the School Board, has recommended a balance of 80% white and 20% nonwhites throughout the city.[12]

Problems at Eckstein Middle School. Reports appearing in the newspapers[13] toward the end of September, 1971, indicate the existence of problems connected with the opening of the Eckstein Middle School. The Seattle Teachers' Association called conditions there "chaotic." An article in the Post-Intelligencer[14] for October, 1971, stated:

> "A packed house of 700 parents registered their discontent with recent events at troubled Nathan Eckstein Middle School last night....Parents voiced concern over overcrowding, lack of books, ungraded learning programs and the absence of letter grades."

David E. Wagoner, Board member, was quoted in the October 14, 1971 Seattle Times, saying that the School Board must make "frank admissions of some administrative failures" over Eckstein Middle School.[15]

The newspaper account described the action of about 40 pickets sponsored by the Roosevelt area Citizens School Advisory Council, standing outside the School District Administrative Building before the Board meeting with signs calling for Council control of the school.

The school, with 1750 students, had been a scene of rumors of racial strife two weeks before. Nothing serious happened, however....Wagoner also said the situation was "back on the track" and called for community support and a breathing spell to allow the school to function. He also suggested that the media had "put the problem completely out of context." "How often do we see the media tell about the good things going on? I think we are entitled to a more balanced presentation," he said. Wagoner also scored the "attitude of the Seattle Teachers' Association" and the "largely negative position of the Roosevelt Council."

Neil Shulman, Roosevelt Council chairman, charged that the administration attempted to "cover up or at least cloud the situation out there. If anything, I would say that the situation is worse than the press has indicated. We were proud of Eckstein--we were proud of the educational standards there. Our pleas fell on deaf ears."

Problems at Lincoln High School. Nine major causes of the racial unrest which resulted in fighting at Lincoln High School (during the week of October 20, 1971) were listed by Alfred E. Cowles, Executive Director of the State Human Rights Commission.[16] Mr. Cowles suggested, among other things, that there had been a lack of preparation for voluntary racial transfers to Lincoln High School. He said this stemmed in part from a lack of recognition of the depth of white racism in that community.

Attacks on Superintendent Bottomly. A letter from a reader to the editor of the Times said[17] "You can hardly pick up a paper or turn on the television these days without encountering carping against School Superintendent Forbes Bottomly."

J. Ben Nickerson, Board candidate running against incumbent Richard J. Alexander, was quoted on October 26, 1971, saying "I have no faith in Bottomly any more. I would definitely try to have him replaced because I have lost confidence in him and thousands of parents have." The Times[18] quoted Nickerson as saying that a big victory for Nickerson and for Delwin R. Chafe, who was opposing Dr. Edward P. Palmason, the other incumbent up for reelection, "would be a mandate for the rest of the Board members to listen to the people."

Injunction and public debate. With the opening of school in the fall of 1971, the mandatory assignment of students to middle schools had been restrained by court injunction. To the extent that Seattle Schools were desegregated, it was accomplished on the basis of a voluntary racial transfer program. Difficulties at Eckstein, Lincoln and Garfield have been mentioned above.

An indication of the depth of emotion experienced at this time is indicated by a story in the Seattle Times[19] of October 28, 1971, describing the burning of a wooden cross in front of a private home in Bellevue.

Discussion occurred in many forms around the city. A sample of the content of those discussions may be inferred by examination of a few headlines in the November, 1971 Seattle newspapers:

VOLUNTEERS SOUGHT FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL RUMOR CONTROL UNIT
BETTER SCHOOL STAFF HUMAN RELATIONS URGED
CLEVELAND GROUP ASKS AID FOR IMMIGRANT STUDENTS
BOY IN CUSTODY AFTER ASSAULT AT SCHOOL
CRISIS STUDY URGED FOR SCHOOL AIDES
HOUSE SHOWDOWN DUE ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
VOUCHER PLAN IN SCHOOLS DEFENDED AS HELP FOR POOR
BOTTOMLY OPPOSES ETHNIC POLICIES FOR SCHOOLS
PROTEST OR NO, MAPLE SCHOOL WILL REOPEN
DECISION TO EXPEL TROUBLEMAKERS SEEN AS FADING AWAY OF OLD DREAMS
SAN FRANCISCO MOTHER STABS TWO TEACHERS IN CLASS
CENTRAL AREA SCHOOL COUNCIL URGES HUGE LEVY
WEST SEATTLE GROUP FAVORS LOW LEVY
BOSTON SCHOOLS FACE RIGHTS SUIT
CONGRESS OKAYS CHILD CARE PLAN, VETO THREATENED
NIXON VETOES GIANT CHILD CARE PROGRAM

Delwin R. Chafe defeated Dr. Edward Palmason in the November school election. Chafe had opposed mandatory bussing and had received the endorsement of the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. Like most challengers he had attacked the School Board's record as deficient, especially for giving support to Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Seattle School Superintendent, on making education changes.[20] Bottomly is the man whom Palmason had praised as one of the best educators in America.

The public discussions of the desegregation issue reached into the Parent-Teacher-Student Association. In mid-December of 1971, the Seattle Council of the PTSA celebrated its 50th anniversary with a lunch and debate on recommendations for desegregating schools.[21] Debate on the recommendations was anticipated to be stormy, for the wording implicitly recognized the mandatory nature of the Seattle School Board's integration plans. These plans had been halted at least temporarily by court actions. The PTSA had never stated opposition or support for School District integration plans prior to that time.

One citizen, said to be speaking bluntly for himself,[22] declared that if a voluntary program was not socially and educationally acceptable to the majority of the people in Seattle then a mandatory program would be equally unacceptable and should not be foisted upon an unwilling public.

Washington law provides for the recall of elected officials. The law requires signatures to petitions which specify charges against the officials to be recalled. Legal procedure, at least in theory, presumes misconduct of the official(s), rather than public whim, to be the basis of recall action.

Recall drive. The State Supreme Court in Olympia, on January 6, 1972, ordered the King County Superior Court to permit circulation of recall petitions by the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing against the members of the Seattle School Board.[23] Named in the recall petitions were Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Mrs. Forrest Smith, Phillip Swain, David Wagoner, and Alfred E. Cowles. Two other members named in the original action had stood for reelection in November. Dr. E. P. Palmason had been defeated by Delwin R. Chafe, and Richard J. Alexander was reelected, making him immune to this recall action. Superior Court Judge Soderland had refused to issue ballot synopses for the petitions in February, 1971. The CAMB appeal had been argued before the Supreme Court in May, 1971. The first charge upheld by the majority of the State Supreme Court was that the Board retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent, although, in the words of the recall petition, he was "unqualified as evidenced by the steady decline in the quality of education." The Court stated "the charge may ultimately prove to be unfounded, even frivolous, but courts are not empowered to make that determination." The second charge the majority upheld was that the School Board members, "knowingly and officially established de jure racial segregation," particularly in the Meany and Madrona schools. Justice Marshall Neill wrote, "the charge states violation of constitutional rights, and if true, would support recall."

Mandatory bussing was not a proper ground for recall of the Seattle School Board, the Supreme Court ruled. Justice Neill referred to a United States Supreme Court decision in the Swann-Mechlenburg case. In that case, the United States Supreme Court upheld a court ordered desegregation plan which incorporated mandatory bussing in a southern school district which was infected with de jure racial segregation. The highest court had rejected the notion that school authorities cannot consider the race of students in formulating and implementing desegregation plans.

Central Area School Council. Alfred E. Cowles, black School Board member, on January 6, 1972, angrily declared he would never vote to rescind the Board's negotiated agreement with the Central Area School Council.[24] Cowles' statement came near the end of the three and one-half hour Board meeting which began with desegregation recommendations by ten of the twelve area citizen school advisory councils and ended with the discussion of council guidelines which took on racial overtones. The Seattle Times described the guidelines controversy as an issue ever since the eleven additional councils had been formed in May of 1971 to join the then, three-year old Central Area School Council.

Unlike the CASC agreement, the guidelines governing the eleven new councils were determined by the administration. They differed on some specifics from the Central Area agreement. One bone of contention had been that the CASC had refused to participate in District council meetings because of legal advice that to do so might jeopardize its unique position. Cowles' declaration came in response to remarks by citizen Neal Shulman who said "the Board is bound legally and morally to treat each of those advisory councils on an equal basis... so that each and every council will have the same power, the same authority and the same responsibility in its relationships with that Board."

Cowles shot back that minorities are "tired of people choosing where they're willing to apply equality." He said the conditions in the Central Area where he resides are unequal.

Cowles said that in the historical context in which the Central Area residents negotiated their agreement with the Board, such an arrangement was necessary to restore the credibility between that community and the Board.

He added, "Any trust that now exists between that community and the school system hinges on that very fragile document...that you are willing to change so quickly... what's at stake in that fragile piece of paper represents the racial tranquility of the climate of the Central Area and its communication with this particular school board."

Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Board President, said, "I personally think it's wrong that we have this bickering that has been going on all these many months since the councils have been formed."

Descriptive of the discussion in public forums during January, 1972, were the following headlines from Seattle newspapers:

CENTRAL AREA GROUP WANTS MORE CONTROL OVER SCHOOLS
QUEEN ANNE COUNCIL OK'S PLAN FOR SCHOOLS
SCHOOL BOARD TO STUDY COURT'S RECALL RULING
COURT CLEARS SCHOOL BOARD RECALL TRY
FLORIDA SPEECH: JACKSON TELLS BUSSING VIEW
BALLARD SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCIL ENDORSES DESEGREGATION REPORT
SEGREGATION RISING IN SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Recall issue. Arguments were presented on January 11, 1972, by attorneys for the Seattle School Board in an appeal against the ruling of the previous August. Superior Court Judge Wilkins had permanently enjoined the District from mandatory transfers and delayed multi-racial middle schools for a year. The case had been brought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing.[25] Attorneys for CAMB said the chief question is "whether neighborhood schools are a property right in this country and whether parents have the primary duty and right and control over the education of the child."

Justice Stafford asked Kennedy (attorney for CAMB) to cite specific court cases where property rights include the right to neighborhood schools. Kennedy said he could not because the issue never had been argued before in the courts.

Kennedy further argued that the real problem of desegregation involves socioeconomic conditions which a simple "mixing of certain percentages of children will not solve."

The Seattle Times reports that in mid-January, School Board members were facing recall action.[26] Board member David E. Wagoner stated "we must respect last week's State Supreme Court ruling allowing the recall attempt to proceed." Wagoner, an attorney, was seconded by the other members facing recall: Tidwell, Swain, Cowles and Mrs. Forrest Smith. Wagoner said that the Board members were willing to take the risk of a recall in their desegregation decision, but the charges against Bottomly are fundamentally unfair...A truly outstanding school Superintendent is a rare commodity, particularly in big city schools, and that is precisely what we have in Seattle in the person of Forbes Bottomly."

Wagoner said a vote would clear the air. He said he only asked that the real issue be faced. "Are we going to allow black children and white children to go to school together," he said. "The issue is as simple as that--it's an educational issue--it's a moral issue--let us have the courage to do what is right." Alexander, originally named in the action but immune because of his reelection in November said, "The charges are completely false, but recall will give voters a vehicle other than a levy election to express themselves."

Other Court Actions

Superintendent Bottomly's plan for desegregating the schools had been held in abeyance because of the Superior Court's injunction. The School District in January, 1972, was waiting a decision on its appeal to the State Supreme Court. Dates set for decision by the School Board to implement the second phase of the desegregation plan had been postponed from February 23, to March 8, then to March 22, March 29 and finally April 12, 1972; during this period the Board's intent crystallized. Leadership in the national government was not in agreement on the issue. For example, the United States Senate took action to strip courts of power to order bussing of children in school desegregation cases.[27]

The Seattle Times, in a feature[28] written at the end of February, stated that the rise of bussing as a national political issue can be traced to three court decisions: the United States Supreme Court's ruling in a Charlotte, North Carolina case in April of 1971, upholding bussing as a means of desegregating the schools; a Federal District Court ruling in September, 1971, that schools in Detroit were unconstitutionally segregated; and a Federal District Court ruling in January, 1972, ordering a consolidation of the 70% black school system in Richmond, Virginia, with the 90% white systems in its two suburban counties. The Times added that Nixon's repudiation of his administration's own desegregation plan for Austin, Texas, in August, 1971, spotlighted the political impact of bussing.

In mid-January the United States Supreme Court agreed to rule for the first time on the bussing of school children to reduce segregation in large cities outside the South.[29] The action was brought to the United States Supreme Court from a case in Denver, Colorado

Citizens' proposals. In response to the Board's invitation of November, 1970, position papers and detailed proposals for desegregation plans were submitted to the Board by more than a dozen citizen groups. These proposals represented an enormous effort by hundreds of people.

Chairpersons and the organizations they represented were: Diane Palmer (Central Area School Council); Ellen Roe (North Region Council, whose members resided in the Ballard, Hale, Ingraham, Lincoln and Roosevelt areas); George J. Burmeister (Ballard Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Ellen Roe (Nathan Hale Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Ray W. Dickhaut (Ingraham Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Kent Kammerer (Lincoln Area Citizens School Advisory Council); Neal J. Shulman (Roosevelt Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Earl Mills (Cleveland Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Nancy Thomas (Franklin Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Joe A. Taller (Queen Anne Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); David Morris, Jr. (Southeast Education Center Citizens' Committee); Jim Gifford (Chief Sealth Citizens' School Advisory Council); Kay Trepanier (West Seattle Citizens' School Advisory Council); and Jean Ulrich (Seattle Parent-Teacher-Student Association).

Other proposals and reports of special significance which the Board had received were developed by the Citizens; Committee for Quality Education, Dr. David G. Colwell, Chairman; the Washington State Board of Education and Washington State Board Against Discrimination; Citizens' Staff Human Relations Task Force, Timmie Faghin and Mildred German, Co-chairpersons; North Central Schools Project, Forney Knox, Chairman.

Task Force on Desegregation Planning. Each of the groups mentioned in the preceding section were invited to present their proposals to the School Board and to meet with staff administrators and planners to further explore the parameters of their proposals. The Superintendent appointed a Task Force on Desegregation Planning to analyze all reports or statements submitted and to present a recommendation.

Members of the Task Force were: Henry Caldwell, Coordinator, Desegregation Planning; James Farris, Specialist, Facilities Technology; Dale Goss, Director, Planning and Evaluation; Mike Hanegan, Population Analyst; Jay Iman, Evaluator; Elmo Little, Supervisor, Instructional Systems Development; and Harold Reasby, Supervisor, Research and Evaluation.

The Task Force presented its report[30] to the Board in February, 1972. The report contained an analysis of each proposal advanced by citizen groups and set forth a proposal of its own. The report, if adopted, would have ended voluntary transfers.[31]

Board efforts to resolve questions. In March, 1972, then, the Board was awaiting the outcome of an appeal to the Washington State Supreme Court on the order of the Superior Court enjoining the District not to implement its mandatory student assignment plan. Public debate on that question had been long and intense. More than a dozen citizen groups had submitted separate proposals on January 6, 1972 to desegregate the schools. The Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation planning had analyzed the citizen proposals and had presented its own recommendation. The Board's timetable called for a decision on March 8. Pending before the Supreme Court was a question, brought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing, whether the charges against Board incumbents were indeed adequate to justify recall, if true. Newspaper reports show Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Board President, attempted to stick to the original goal of March 8 for the Board to adopt a desegregation plan. The Seattle School Board did meet on March 8, 1972. The Board minutes show that Resolution 1972-3 had been introduced and discussion followed. The Resolution stated, in part:

> "WHEREAS significant educational research has indicated the detrimental effect that racial isolation has on educational achievement; and WHEREAS this research has also indicated the positive effect of integrated education on children from racial or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups;...NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Board go on record as indicating that it will implement at least the first phase of a total desegregation plan in September, 1972, subject to the restrictions of the Honorable William J. Wilkins, unless those restrictions are to vacate it or supercede it."

The Board minutes indicate that the resolution was not passed and further discussion of the resolution was postponed until the next regular meeting. However, there was no mention of the resolution in the Board minutes of March 15, 1972. The minutes of March 22, 1972, indicate that there had been a motion to delay the mandatory desegregation decision until a decision was handed down by the Washington State Supreme Court and that the School Board use the time to meet and confer with all citizen-elected councils to improve communication and secure meaningful input and request technical assistance from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Seattle Times[32], in reporting the Board meeting of March 22, indicated that the School Board was split on desegregation 4 to 3. Mrs. Forrest Smith, Board President, is quoted as saying, "I would be uncomfortable taking action while an injunction is upon us." She said that was why she had supported a motion the previous day to do no planning on any mandatory desegregation programs until the State Supreme Court ruled on a Superior Court injunction against mandatory student reassignments here. Hers had been the key vote in the 4 to 3 decision. Mrs. Smith had been absent Monday, March 20, from the Board meeting where a split for going ahead or delaying became apparent.

Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent, had told the Board that time practically had run out for his staff to prepare to put into operation even the middle school desegregation plan delayed by Wilkins' court order and only one or two schools pairing for voluntary desegregation. Bottomly told newsmen that he was disappointed that the Board could not eradicate segregation. He said the Board knew his views over the past six years but the decision was up to them. Board members Richard J. Alexander and Delwin R. Chafe joined Cowles and Mrs. Smith in voting for the motion. Three Board members, Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, President, Philip B. Swain, and David E. Wagoner, voted against the motion. Board member Philip Swain said: "We've been involved in the process of talking and talking and talking and meeting and meeting and meeting and conferring and conferring and conferring and sometime you have to bring this process to a head." The Board had considered but took no action on a tabled resolution that had been presented on March 8, that the Board go ahead with the first phase of a total desegregation plan in September, 1972. Board member Alexander who had presented the motion said that he was convinced that only a federal court ordered desegregation could unify the city.

Cowles told fellow Board members that they had not listened to minority community concerns and he asked General Counsel Little if the Board could undo the delayed middle school desegregation.

Little said that the Board could do so, but he also warned of the "ratchet theory" used in federal cases involving Denver. The theory is that, like a ratchet wrench, once it moves forward, it cannot go backwards. Little explained later that the Board having moved to desegregate Meany-Madrona, would have to do something to continue that, although it would not necessarily have to involve those three middle schools in the delayed plan.

John de Yonge, writing in a March, 1972, issue of the Post-Intelligencer, stated that mandatory school desegregation -- and thus, bussing -- in Seattle that fall was then all but ruled out.[33] He wrote that the Seattle School Board voted 4 to 3 to delay a decision on mandatory desegregation--virtually guaranteeing that no child would be required to leave his heighborhood school the next year.

After the vote, Board member Swain said the Board was shirking its duty to desegregate schools here, and he prepared a motion to have the Board state that if volunteerism fails to desegregate the elementary schools next year, the Board would order mandatory desegregation the year after.[34] Swain withdrew his motion, however, when he was advised in private that if the Board turned down his motion on split vote it would make moot the Board's appeal of the local court order to the State Supreme Court.

At the conclusion of the meeting Dr. Robert A. Tidwell stated, "I had a speech prepared but I'll make this short. I resign as of now. The meeting is adjourned." Tidwell had voted with members Wagoner and Swain to continue mandatory school desegregation in recent 4 to 3 school board votes and told newsmen who met him as he left the board table, "I am through--I have just had it. I am tired of this constant bickering." The Post-Intelligencer stated that Tidwell had been known for being outspoken, and had suffered two heart attacks during his Board service but had shrugged off questions about his health. Tidwell did note that the Board was expected to meet constantly, in part to be vilified by persons opposing Board policy. He had stressed that he had been particularly frustrated over what he considered to be the bickering on a problem, desegregation. He stated that there was no question about how it should be solved.

Tidwell's resignation would change the lineup on the School Board. It remained uncertain how the resignation would affect the standing 4 to 3 Board split on desegregation questions.

Court decisions. The Washington State Supreme Court[35] dissolved a ban against mandatory desegregation and mandatory bussing in Seattle on April 6, 1972. The Court ruling, said in part, "We find no authority in law for the proposition that parents have a vested right to send their children to, or that children have a vested right to attend, any particular public school."

Ballot synopses in the School Board recall attempt by the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing were released on April 7, 1972. CAMB brought seven original charges against the Board to support recall. The State Supreme Court allowed two to remain. The synopses reflect those charges.[36] One said that the members involved "retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent...knowing that Dr. Forbes Bottomly is unqualified to carry out the duties of such a position." The second stated that the members "knowingly established and imposed racial segregation of students within the said school district and particularly in the Meany and Madrona schools thereof." Release of the ballot symopses cleared the way for CAMB to get the necessary signatures to force a recall election.

On the same day in which synopses of School Board recall charges were released, Dr. Forbes Bottomly said that the mandatory middle school desegregation plan would go ahead in the fall unless he was countermanded by the School Board.[37]

"I am assuming," Bottomly said, "that the decison that the School Board made in November, 1970, and January, 1971, is still in effect and has not been rescinded, and the direction to me is pretty clear. The injunction has been lifted and we'll move ahead with our planning to get the middle school desegregation going next fall." When asked to comment, Del R. Chafe, the most recently elected Board member stated, "It certainly doesn't change my position. We have heard pretty clearly from the Roosevelt Council and the Central Area Council that they are not going to participate. It is my fervent hope that this Board will reanalyze its position and try to make the voluntary thing go, but it's a hope only."

At its regular meeting on April 12, 1972, the School Board[38] heard General Counsel Gary M. Little discuss the unanimous decision of the Washington State Supreme Court reversing and dismissing Judge Wilkins' earlier opinion on the case brought against the School District by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. Director Chafe requested counsels' opinion concerning the Board's posture regarding the Meany-Madrona Middle School desegregation plan and the voluntary desegregation plan approved by the Board in pairing of elementary schools in the fall of 1972.

Mr. Little pointed out that the School Board had acted on November 11, 1970, and again on January 27, 1971, to adopt a desegregation plan for the middle schools, grades 5 to 8. The Board subsequently dropped the fifth grade from the plan, which included mandatory reassignment between Meany-Madrona and the Eckstein, Hamilton, and Wilson Middle Schools. Implementation of the plan was stopped by issuance of the injunction by Judge Wilkins, and its dissolution, Little said, leaves the original desegregation plan for multi-racial middle schools as effective school policy. The elementary school voluntary transfer plan adopted on March 29, 1972, was not a part of the lawsuit, Little stated.

Superintendent Bottomly stated that the District could mount the middle school program for the fall of 1972 since most of the planning had been completed the previous year and he had requested the staff to concentrate on the remaining details.

Mr. Chafe then moved that "this Board reconsider the decision of November, 1970, concerning the mandatory program for the middle schools." Board member Cheryl Bleakney questioned whether reconsideration of this whole issue would put the Board in any legal jeopardy. Mr. Little pointed out that in his opinion the School Board should not do anything that would resegregate or add to the segregation of any school, and would have to give careful consideration to the efforts of any change of previously adopted policy. Further, when the Board adopted the multi-racial middle school plan, it applied for and received federal funding in the amount of $1.5 million of which about half had already been spent in preparation of the first phase of the plan. The third facet was that a group of parents had accused the Board (with a case then pending in Federal Court) of deliberately segregating the Meany-Madrona Middle School, so that any action taken by the Board which resulted in de jure segregation of Meany-Madrona would have an effect on the case. It might also be considered malfeasance, Little added.

The motion made by Mr. Chafe was dropped for lack of a second.

Discussion at the Board meeting moved then to planning for the middle school desegregation. Mrs. Diane Palmer, Chairman, Central Area School Council, read a prepared statement iterating that Council's support of its proposed desegregation-education plan and its feeling that the School Board had not adequately considered the needs of the Central Area, resulting in the CASC's decision to encourage its community not to participate in any desegregation plan proposed by the Seattle School Board.

President Cowles expressed his concern and that of the entire Board that the various sections of the City had not offered the kind of support needed to make any plan successful. He pointed out that the Board had always been acutely aware that its members bore the final responsibility for making a decision and the Board's desire for meeting and discussing proposals with all groups. He said that the Board today is informing the administration of its intent to follow through on decisions made a year and a half ago, having not availed itself of a motion to reconsider that decision.

On September 6, 1972, classes began in the four desegregated middle schools, thus completing the first phase of a long-range plan to provide quality, integrated education for students in the Seattle Public Schools.[39]

Recall movement. February 6, 1973, was the date set for the special levy election and for the election to decide the question whether Board members Wagoner, Smith, Cowles, and Swain should be recalled. Forces behind the recall movement had stated that the movement was being sponsored in an effort to rid the Board of Bottomly supporters in order to accomplish the discharge of Bottomly. An editorial in the Post-Intelligencer (February 1, 1973) stated:

> "Instead of massive court orders to desegregate, Seattle students are involved in a thoughtful, orderly process of racial integration. Everyone should understand that the beginnings of the recall effort came as a result of the Board's policy of peaceful, mandatory bussing, an issue which the courts would not allow on the ballot. It should be a matter of pride here that Seattle is the largest major city that is desegregated on its own, without a court order.
>
> "The nature of the campaign waged on behalf of recall has been negative and destructive and if it succeeds could open Seattle to strife and tension."

A substantial number of members of the School Advisory Councils were involved in the recall movement, according to an article by Constantine Angelos.[40] Sixty-seven members of elected Citizen School Advisory Councils, acting as individuals, had signed a statement supporting the recall of four Seattle School Board members in Tuesday's election, PRO announced. PRO (People for Responsive Officials) was the group organized to promote the recall instituted by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. It was headed by the chairmen of six of the councils.

"The arrogant defiance by Forbes Bottomly and the Seattle School Board of the clearly expressed will of the people of Seattle has produced the reaction by the public that has crystallized into the formation of PRO," the statement said.

The statement said the "ordinary citizen" is fed up with ballooning school budgets, bungled attempts to implement new, untested methods of teaching, declining achievement levels, and an admitted change in emphasis in the schools from education to social reform.

A sample recall ballot was printed in the *Seattle Times*, February 4, 1973. It is quoted here in full:

RECALL BALLOT NUMBER ONE
BALLOT SYNOPSIS OF RECALL CHARGE AGAINST ALFRED E. COWLES

> "Alfred E. Cowles, as a member of the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1, committed acts of misfeasance, malfeasance or violation of oath of office in the following particulars: 1) Acting in concert with other members of said Board, he has retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent of said School District knowing that Dr. Forbes Bottomly is unqualified to carry out the duties of such position.
> 2) Acting in concert with other members of said Board, he has knowingly established and imposed racial segregation of students within said School District and particularly to the Meany and Madrona schools thereof."

The recall drive had been initiated by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing on January 19, 1971, against all seven members then on the Board.[41] Since that time Dr. Edward P. Palmason had been defeated for reelection in the fall of 1971. R. J. Alexander became immune to the recall by being reelected, and Dr. Robert A. Tidwell resigned from the Board in March, 1972.

In an attempt to derail mandatory racial desegregation, CAMB originally brought seven charges against Board members. In January, 1972, the State Supreme Court threw out five of seven charges, all dealing with mandatory bussing and desegregation. The Court said the United States Supreme Court decisions showed that the School Board had the authority to desegregate schools, using mandatory bussing, if necessary.

Although none of the Board members were recalled in the election of February, 1973, the victory for the incumbent Board members may not be termed decisive. Superintendent Forbes Bottomly subsequently tendered his resignation.

Provision for federal funding, Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act. In April, 1973, the Board adopted Resolution 1973-4 in order to utilize funds available as a result of legislation contained in Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act for establishing the program base, staff training, and voluntary participation commitment necessary for further expansion of the Board's desegregation efforts.

The resolution, basically a summary of the Board's previous actions, nevertheless constituted an important statement of the Board's goals on desegregation. These included:

- Continuing the middle school desegregation program
- Continuing the voluntary racial transfer program
- Continuing multi-ethnic and human relations programs for staff, community and students
- Expanding the District's effort to remediate basic skills deficiencies which may exist in low income and minority schools
- Encouraging the return of white Central Area residents and voluntary transfer of other white students to Central Area schools
- Eliminating or reducing the minority isolation in South Region schools through voluntary transfers
- Reassessing the success of various strategies for overcoming segregation in Seattle Schools and determining procedures in 1974-75 for completely eliminating minority group isolation during the 1975-76 school year.

Resolution 1973-4, adopted April 11, 1973, is contained in Appendix B, p. 33.

The desegregation of Garfield High School. As outlined earlier in this paper, the Citizens Committee for Quality Education (CCQE) had presented its report on June 23, 1971, to the Seattle School Board. The Board met again on July 14, 1971, to hear a fuller discussion from all segments of the City including the area councils. Of particular significance to the action taken by the Board in June, 1974, in desegregating Garfield High School, was the statement of the Central Area School Council read at the July 14, 1971, School Board meeting. The statement read by Larry Gossett reads in part,

> "We, however, completely reject the CCQE recommendation of June, 1971, to disperse the children of minority races throughout the schools of Seattle so that they nowhere exceed 20% of any school's enrollment.
>
> "We are particularly concerned with the black children of Seattle. The history of the education of black children in Seattle is a story of virtually unmitigated neglect. In the past two years through the efforts of the Central Area community working with the decentralized school administration, the previous neglect has been transformed into an effective concern. It has demonstrated that black children in predominantly black schools can achieve. We now fear that the progress and the education of black children just begun will be negated by an integration program which, however, well intentioned, is based on the premise that a school of 21% black children is segregated and undesirable while a school of 80% white children is integrated and desirable.

> "The special situation of the black minority in a predominantly white culture requires an unusual extent of black community control over the education of black children. Erosion of this control in past years is evident in the closing of Central Area schools and implementation of a voluntary transfer program that is overwhelmingly out of the Central Area. We recognize and deplore continuing moves that diminish black control of black education in the form of threats to close Garfield and the CCQE proposal that seeks to disperse black children throughout the city.
>
> "With these considerations in mind we offer the School Board the following proposals in the belief that the dual causes of education and integration would be served by their adoption."

The suggestions contained in the CCQE proposal were to strengthen the Central Area education program by upgrading existing facilities and constructing new educational facilities within the Central Area, via continuing support of the Central Area School Council and the Central Area School Administration; by terminating the program of voluntary transfer out of the Central Area and its implicit condemnation of Central Area's schools as second rate with the consequent deprivation of Central Area schools of sufficient students to develop optimal educational programs at all levels; and for encouraging voluntary transfer into Central Area schools. Mr. Gossett stated that the primary concern of Central Area citizens is that they do not want black children spread out all over the city.

Dr. Mike Hickey, Associate Superintendent for Instruction, Seattle School District, expressed concern about the apparent position of the District with regard to further school desegregation.[42] In an April, 1974, Recommendation of the Instructional Division for Further Desegregation of the Seattle Schools he stated that this concern stemmed from several factors: 1) The failure of the District to demonstrate further movement toward desegregation since the inception of the mandatory reassignment program in the fall of 1972. This decision (or nondecision) was presumably based on the perceived need for "settling in" to assess progress and to consolidate gains made thus far, 2) there had been a retrogression in District progress toward desegregation due to a variety of factors, including the increased influx of minority students into the District, movement of minorities within the District, and a falling off of voluntary transfers, particularly minority youngsters, as they return to Central Area schools, 3) an overriding concern in all of this was the possibility of a lawsuit which would force a court ordered total mandatory desegregation of the entire District if actions, or the lack of actions, were to be interpreted as segregation or as an inadequate manifestation of commitment to voluntary desegregation of our schools. The recommendations (sometimes referred to as "the Hickey report") contained suggestions for long-range development of modified "magnet" schools or programs within the District.

On June 12, 1974, the League of Women Voters of Seattle expressed concern to the Seattle School Board that the vigorous beginning to school desegregation in Seattle had lost its momentum. References were made to the need to build up the enrollment at Garfield High School by methods which would increase racial integration. The League proposed a "magnet" school concept for Garfield, one which would attract and satisfy the needs of an integrated enrollment, and urged that the plan adopted for Garfield take into account the academic and vocational needs of the variety of students within the attendance area, and that adequate funding be assured to carry on the program for a reasonable period of time.

Philip Swain presented a resolution on desegregation on behalf of a committee of the Board comprising Mrs. Sutton, Mr. Gayton, and himself. They had received a charge at the Board meeting of June 5, 1974, to bring their colleagues a resolution reaffirming and updating the commitment of the Seattle School District to desegregation of the educational program for young people in the Seattle area. He pointed out that the resolution essentially accomplished two things: 1) it affirmed the District's long standing commitments to desegregation and several cases made prior to the majority of the present membership of the Board having been involved; it was an important reaffirmation and involvement of people who were not parties to some of the original decisions; 2) in addition, it focused in on some of the shorter term actions of the coming two school years that the committee saw and recommended as particularly important if the District were to move forward in giving effect to those longer range goals. The committee was ready to answer questions from other Board members and he urged that time enough be retained for full review and discussion of this resolution. He expressed the personal hope that the end product of that review and discussion might be action on this resolution. The resolution stated the Board's intention to desegregate Garfield High School in September, 1975. Desegregation was to be achieved by eliminating all transfers granted to students after June, 1975, who were not participating in the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, and who were residents of the Garfield Attendance Area, and by adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries. The Board anticipated the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district. The resolution is given here in full:

RESOLUTION NO. 1974-14

> WHEREAS, the Board has studied the administrative reports entitled "Preliminary Report Desegregation Planning Tulsa Public Schools" and "Recommendation of the Instruction Division for the Further Desegregation of Seattle Public Schools" and endorses the general concepts and planning recommendations in those reports; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Board has adopted as its goal on Affirmative Action Program of recruiting, hiring and placing staffs in every department in every school and at every level of operation with proportions of racial minority to total employees corresponding to the proportions of racial minority students to total students in the entire school system; and
>
> WHEREAS, the Seattle School District has for a number of years worked to improve ethnic balance in the schools and provide a degree of multiethnic educational environment for all children during their educational careers; and

WHEREAS, the voluntary program has provided several thousand students the opportunity to attend multi-ethnic classes during the past several years; and

WHEREAS, the District has a mandatory reassignment program in effect at the middle schools in the Lincoln-Roosevelt-Garfield areas; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle School Board reaffirms its policy to work toward desegregation by whatever just, reasonable and educationally sound means are available to us; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. Garfield High School shall be desegregated with the beginning of the 1975-76 school year. Desegregation shall be accomplished by the elimination of all transfers granted to students who would normally graduate from high school after June, 1975, who are not participating in the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, and who are residents of the Garfield attendance area; by adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries; and by the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district.

2. The District shall commit and allocate resources to other multi-ethnic and multi-cultural secondary schools to maintain and enhance their drawing power and academic excellence.

3. Every school that is de facto segregated shall, during the 1974-75 school year, be paired with a school without a significant minority enrollment.

   The paired schools will develop frequent informal contacts between the two staffs, student bodies and parent groups. Planning for the 1975-76 school year shall include multi-ethnic and multi-cultural exchanges involving teachers, students and families, shared educational experiences such as assemblies, field trips and short-term and long-term student transfers.

4. The District shall initiate immediately a boundary realignment study for those schools that are de facto segregated to determine the effect on the racial composition of school attendance areas of redrawing boundaries for 1975-76 with a conscious attempt to bring about a better ethnic balance.

5. The District's commitment to the Voluntary Transfer Program is reaffirmed. Support will be provided to make it of maximum effectiveness.

6. The administration is directed to provide and integrate resources to carry out the concepts and recommendations in the administrative reports including attention to facilities consolidation and upgrading, planning, transportation patterns, multi-ethnic staffing, staff preparation, student assignment, transfer policies and placement procedures, necessary funding, community involvement, etc. An operational plan incorporating those elements is to be presented for Board consideration and subsequent approval by September 1, 1974.

Adopted this 12th day of June, 1974.

On August 20, 1975, Resolution 1974-14 was amended as follows:

> "Those students who will be seniors in the 1975-76 school year and who were not granted written one-year exemptions from Garfield for the 1974-75 school year may, in accordance with School District policy, apply for an exemption from assignment to Garfield to complete their senior year in the school to which they were previously assigned.
>
> Each such application may be based only on the grounds of (a) activities, or (b) special courses in which the applicant is involved. Each such case is subject to a review and approval by the superintendent's designee."

On September 3, 1974, Mike Hickey, Associate Superintendent, Instruction Division, set forth the Operational Plan for School Desegregation, 1974-75.[43] The Plan was presented to the Board on September 11, 1974. The fifteen-page document is spread on the minutes of that date, and contains detailed, operational statements of intent to implement the Board's policy. The Operational Plan, therefore, is the document that interprets Board policy in concrete, detailed terms. The Plan focused on the following major program areas:

1. Desegregation of Garfield High School
2. Multi-ethnic/multi-cultural secondary schools
3. Paired schools program
4. Boundary realignment study
5. Voluntary transfer program.

The Plan was followed on March 3, 1975, with a Mid-Year Progress Report on the Implementation of School Desegregation Plan, 1975-76.[44] The Mid-Year Progress Report stated that, with a few minor exceptions, the activities set forth in the earlier plan were occurring as projected and within anticipated schedules. Embodied in the report are summaries of major activities in each of the program areas addressed in the Operational Plan.

1. Garfield High School. Resolution 1974-14 identified three strategies to be utilized in the desegregation of Garfield High School. The first one called for the elimination of all transfers granted to students residing in the district, with exceptions noted in the amendment of August 20, 1975. This effort was about 50% successful, according to a statement by Jim Page, Advisory Specialist for Desegregation.[45] Page stated that the discrepancy between White and Black enrollment was narrowed by approximately 18%. The second strategy called for adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries. The Boundary Realignment Study revealed that this strategy to desegregate Garfield was not feasible. Enlarging the Garfield attendance boundaries would result in overcrowding at Garfield, and underutilization of facilities adjacent to Garfield.

   The third strategy called for the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district. Dr. Hal Reasby, Deputy Superintendent for Region I, has outlined the methods by which this will be achieved in the Preliminary Planning Document III, 1975-76: An Operational Plan for Development of Garfield High School as an Innovative, Exemplary, and Comprehensive High School.[46] The Planning Document states the goals, objectives, and tasks to be accomplished along with the lines of responsibility needed to develop exemplary academic and occupational programs at Garfield.

2. Multi-ethnic/Multi-cultural Secondary Schools. In the early planning (c. 1970) for the District efforts for desegregation, it was determined that the schools in the South East area of the city already had a desirable racial balance. Six secondary schools were identified as "multi-ethnic/multi-cultural secondary schools". These schools were: Cleveland, Franklin, Mercer, Rainier Beach, Sharples, (and South Shore). A decision was therefore made that efforts and resources should be assigned to stabilize the existing racial balance and to enhance the programs in those schools. Therefore, no effort was made to change the assignment of students in these attendance areas to other schools.

   Resources were assigned to each of the schools to develop projects in the following areas: 1) special staffing needs to improve staff ethnic representation, 2) enrichment of curricular programs, 3) staff development and training programs, 4) student activity programs, and 5) specialized bilingual and multi-cultural programs.

3. Paired Schools Programs. A third major emphasis of School Board Resolution 1974-14 directed integration efforts in Region II toward reducing the effects of racial isolation through concentrating on a Paired School model for elementary-age students and additional funding for multi-racial secondary schools. For 1975-76, the paired schools approach becomes just one of many suggested activities that school staffs might adopt, but it is not structured for sixteen schools as in 1974-75.

Minority isolated and non-isolated schools are matched, and cooperative arrangements are developed between paired schools so that minority and non-minority students, teachers, and parents may have opportunities to get to know one another and to share experiences which assist in developing understanding of ethnicity and cultural pluralism.

4. Boundary Realignment. Jim Page, Advisory Specialist for Desegregation, stated that the possibility of boundary realignment was studied as a possible vehicle for desegregation and then sidelined because of apparent weaknesses as a major desegregation tool.[47]

5. Voluntary Transfer Program. The Voluntary Racial Transfer Program was initiated by the School Board in the fall of 1963. It was the District's initial effort to reduce racial imbalance in the Seattle Schools. The VRT program has, in the main, been a one-way program in which black students transferred out of Central Area schools to majority-white schools. This program, which had 247 students participating in 1963, reached its peak in 1969-70 when the VRT enrollment was 2,600 (black 2,200 - white 400). This year, 1975-76, there are 1,476 voluntary transfer students (black 1,109 - white 349 - other 18). Included in the enrollment count from 1965 to 1971 were approximately 350 students from Mann, Leschi and Summit, who were mandatorily assigned to north end schools under a building utilization program.

   The program provides free bus transportation to and from school and human relations programs and activities in a number of schools which are receiving VRT students.

Title VII Funding Controversy

The Seattle School District received notification on June 12, 1975 that Title VII (Emergency School Aid Act) funding which supported a basic skills program, the Ethnic Cultural Heritage program, and Project Bridge would be withdrawn, because of alleged failure on the part of the District to comply with provisions for assuring special instruction to students whose education is hampered by limited English speaking ability, and for practicing racial discrimination in placing racial minority teachers disproportionately in schools with substantial enrollments of minority students. In addition, the Office of Civil Rights has commenced administrative enforcement proceedings against the District under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The charges involved are the same as the Title VII issues--service to students with limited speaking ability and minority staffing distribution. The District has responded that the Office of Civil Rights should await the findings of the Court in the ESAA suit filed by the District in July before proceeding under Title VI. OCR contends, however, that the ESAA issue and Title VI enforcement are separate matters and that they are required by law to continue their efforts to terminate all federal assistance to the District (about $7 million annually) unless the District agrees to their prescribed corrective actions. Resolution of this issue awaits the decision of the court as it relates to ESAA Title VII funding. The District is involved in administrative efforts to resolve the concerns of the Office of Civil Rights with respect to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION NO. 1971-3
CONCERNING DESEGREGATION AND INTEGRATION OF SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the State of Washington maintains that education is the paramount duty of the State; and

WHEREAS, the administration of the public school system of this district is vested in the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1; and

WHEREAS, the United States of America, the State of Washington, and the City of Seattle constitute a multiracial society, and the success of this society depends upon the mutual respect and understanding which are fostered in the public school system; and

WHEREAS, significant educational research has indicated the detrimental effect that racial isolation has on educational achievement; and

WHEREAS, this research has also indicated the positive effect of integrated education on children from racial or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups; and

WHEREAS, we, the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1 have found that the best interest of the children of Seattle School District No. 1 will be served by providing all school children with a quality multiracial education; and

WHEREAS, since 1963 the Seattle School Board has moved in every feasible and educationally sound way toward integration of Seattle school children, and despite these efforts de facto segregation and resultant racial isolation have increased;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1 instructs the administration to implement the desegregation plan as hereinafter outlined:

1. Grades 5-8 in the Lincoln, Roosevelt and Meany-Madrona attendance areas are to be integrated by the exchange of approximately 600 grade 5-8 students from the Lincoln-Roosevelt area to the Meany-Madrona Middle School and approximately 600 Meany-Madrona area students to the Lincoln-Roosevelt area schools.

2. Transportation is to be made available to the approximately 1,200 students in this program.

3. Continuous progress education including individualized instruction in the basic subjects and a wide diversity of special interest programs including advanced courses, creative arts and environmental education is to be a part of the curriculum for the middle schools.

4. The administration is to assure that these middle schools will be staffed with principals, teachers, and others who will provide the educational and human relations leadership which is required and who desire to work in the integrated school and who will take part in programs for individualized instruction, continuous progress, and multiracial education.

5. The administration is to establish a planning steering committee made up of representatives of the Central Area School Council and of the interim advisory councils of the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas pending formation of elected councils in these two areas. Membership on this steering committee should also include liaison persons from the Citizens Committee for Quality Education. This steering committee will work closely with the chief planners in developing and achieving overall planning objectives. In addition, means for parent, teacher, and student involvement in each of the planning task forces will be worked out. The administration is directed to provide within two weeks a system for such participation. It is the School Board's wish that there be as much community participation as possible in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the plan.

6. Insofar as is feasible, the exchange plan will adhere to the following organization:

   Lincoln-Roosevelt areas

   1. Eckstein, Hamilton, and Wilson will be grades 6-8 middle schools.

   2. Marshall will be grades 9-12 satellite of Roosevelt. Special Education programs will continue at Marshall.

   3. Marshall 1970-71 grade 7 (1971-72 grade 8) students will be distributed between Eckstein and Hamilton.

   4. Interlake will be a 9-12 satellite of Lincoln.

   5. All elementary feeders will be K-5.

   6. Students (K-5) from Interlake will be distributed among Day, Latona, and McDonald.

   Meany-Madrona Area

   1. Meany will continue as a grade 7-8 middle school. Madrona will continue as a grade 5-6 middle school component of the Meany-Madrona grade 5-8 middle school complex. Leschi, Lowell. McGilvra, Minor, Montlake, Seward, and Stevens will be K-4 feeders to Madrona which along with Colman and Gatzert will feed Meany.

2. Meany in turn will continue to feed the Garfield-Washington grade 9-12 complex which will continue to be a comprehensive high school. Harrison will remain a K-2 primary school. Colman and Gatzert will remain K-6 feeders to Meany.

   Fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who are assigned for the 1971-72 school year will be chosen from contiguous geographic regions from the elementary attendance area within which they reside. Some students will be reassigned from the following elementary attendance areas:

   B.F. Day - McDonald
   Bagley - Olympic View
   Bryant - Laurelhurst - Sand Point - University Heights
   Leschi - Lowell - McGilvra - Minor - Montlake - Seward -Stevens - and the former Mann, Summit, and Madrona attendance areas.

Adopted by the Seattle School Board, January 27, 1971.

APPENDIX B

RESOLUTION NUMBER 1973-4

WHEREAS, the Seattle School Board has recognized the negative educational effects of racial isolation within schools and has publicly indicated its commitment to eliminate such isolation utilizing whatever just, reasonable, and educationally sound means are available; and

WHEREAS, the Board has demonstrated this commitment through a variety of means, including the Phase I Middle School desegregation, the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, the South Region Voluntary Pairing Program, inter-District transfer efforts with Bellevue and Mercer Island School Districts, minority staffing efforts, and human relations training programs for teachers, parents, students; and

WHEREAS, the Board views the recommendation of January 12, 1973, from the administration on utilizing Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act funds as the means of establishing the program base, staff training, and voluntary participation commitment necessary for further expansion of the Board's previous efforts;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board considers the aforementioned efforts as the natural extension and intensification of its overall effort toward eliminating, reducing, and remediating the effects of minority group isolation within the Seattle Public Schools, as set forth in its statement of January 27, 1971, and approves the following timeline for continuation of its desegregation efforts:

a) Continue Phase I activities in the Roosevelt-Lincoln-Garfield attendance areas during 1973-74;

b) Continue to actively solicit participants in the District-Wide Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, with active support from C.Q.I.E. and other interested and school groups, during 1973-74;

c) Continue and expand programs for staff, community and student training on multiethnic awareness and human relations awareness, with substantial increases in service to South Region schools, including (as funding permits) cooperatively planned and executed projects between minority isolated and nonisolated schools during 1973-74;

d) Increasing the District's efforts to remediate Basic Skills deficits which may exist in low-income and isolated schools so achievement differentials between students from exchanging schools will not hamper efforts toward eliminating racial isolation, during 1973-74;

e) Conducting a greatly expanded and intensified campaign to recruit voluntary transfers between minority isolated and non-isolated schools during the Spring quarter of the 1973-74 school year;

f) Encouraging the return of nonminority Central Area residents and voluntary transfer of other nonminority students to Central Area schools to reestablish attendance patterns that reflect residential statistics, thereby eliminating minority isolation at Central Region schools during 1973-74;

g) Eliminating or reducing by 10%, the minority isolation (as defined by ESAA Title VII) at half of the 1973-74 "isolated" South Region schools as a result of voluntary transferring recruited by the programs and the recruitment campaigns operated during 1973-74 for school year 1974-75;

h) Reassess the efficacy of the various strategies to reduce and eliminate minority group isolation and determine the most feasible procedures for completely eliminating minority group isolation for 1975-76 school year, during 1974-75.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 1973.

NOTES

1. *Report of the Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning*, Seattle Public Schools, February, 1972, pp. 12-13.

2. *Board Minutes*, Seattle School District, Nov. 11, 1970.

3. "CAMB Sues to Push Recall," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 11, 1971.

4. "Recall Charges Against School Board 'Not Valid'; *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Feb. 27, 1971.

5. *Board Minutes*, Seattle School District, Jan. 27, 1971.

6. Citizens Committee for Quality Education, *Planning Recommendations for Cultural and Structural Integration of the Seattle Public Schools*, Final Report, June, 1971.

7. "Judge Halts Desegregation Plans," *Seattle Times*, Aug. 10, 1971.

8. "STA Official Asks for Orderly Opening," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, August 11, 1971.

9. "Nixon In No-Bussing Ultimatum," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Aug. 11, 1971.

10. "Free School Breakfasts?" *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Aug. 27, 1971.

11. "CAMB Endorses Three in School Board Race," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Sept. 3, 1971.

12. "Refusal to Build at Garfield is Cited," *Seattle Times*, Sept. 1, 1971.

13. "New Principal Named at Eckstein School," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Sept. 28, 1971.

14. "700 Eckstein Parents Air Discontent," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Oct. 5, 1971.

15. "'Board Must Admit' Eckstein Failures," *Seattle Times*, Oct. 14, 1971.

16. "Causes of Lincoln Unrest Are Listed," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Oct. 20, 1971.

17. Letter to Editor, Seattle Times, Oct. 21, 1971.

18. "Nickerson Hits Middle School Plan," Seattle Times, Oct. 26, 1971.

19. "Cross Burned at Home in Bellevue," Seattle Times, Oct. 28, 1971.

20. "Purpose of School Key Issue in Palmason-Chafe Race," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Oct. 29, 1971.

21. "School Plans to be Debated," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Dec. 14, 1971.

22. "Small Crowd Generates Heat at Bussing Hearing," Seattle Times, Dec. 14, 1971.

23. "State High Court OK's School Recall Petitions," Seattle Times, Jan. 6, 1972.

24. "Cowles Defends Central Area Post," Seattle Times, Jan. 6, 1972.

25. "High Court Hears Seattle Board's Bussing Appeal," Seattle Times, Jan. 12, 1972.

26. "School Board Members Vow Readiness to Ask Recall," Seattle Times, Jan. 13, 1972.

27. "Senate Strips Courts of Power to Order Bussing," Seattle Times, Feb. 25, 1972.

28. "Three Court Rulings Made Bussing a National Issue," Seattle Times, Feb. 27, 1972.

29. "High Court to Rule on School Bussing," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Jan. 18, 1972.

30. Report of the Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning, Seattle Public Schools, February, 1972.

31. "Report Would End Voluntary Transfers," Seattle Times, Feb. 27, 1972.

32. "School Board Split on Desegregation, 4-3," Seattle Times, March 23, 1972.

33. "Vote All But Cuts Out Fall Bussing," Seattle Post Intelligencer, March 23, 1972.

34. "Tidwell Quits School Board in Frustration," Seattle Post Intelligencer, March 30, 1972.

35. "High Court's Ruling on School Bussing," Seattle Post Intelligencer, April 7, 1972.

36. "Synopses of School Board Recall Ballots," *Seattle Times*, April 7, 1972.

37. "Bottomly says 'Go' on Mandatory Plan," *Seattle Times*, April 7, 1972.

38. *Board Minutes*, Seattle School District, April 12, 1972.

39. *Abstract*, *Middle Schools in Perspective*, Seattle Public Schools, 1973, p. 7.

40. "67 Members of Advisory Councils Back Action," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 2, 1973.

41. "Recall Failing, Levy Defeated," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Feb. 7, 1973.

42. Mike Hickey, *Recommendations of the Instructional Division for the Further Desegregation of Seattle Public Schools*, April 22, 1974.

43. Seattle Public Schools Instruction Division, *Operational Plan for School Desegregation, 1974-75*, 15 pp.

44. Mike Hickey memorandum to Loren Troxel, March 3, 1975, *Mid-Year Progress Report: Implementation of School Desegregation Plan, 1974-75*, 16 pp.

45. Jim Page, Memorandum to Dr. Consuelo Shaw, Oct. 20, 1975.

46. Hal Reasby, *Preliminary Planning Document III, 1975-76: An Operational Plan for Development of Garfield High School as an Innovative, Exemplary, and Comprehensive High School, Year III*, 21 pp.

47. Jim Page, op. cit.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

A NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESEGREGATION GOALS FOR THE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1970-1975

REPORT NO. 75-29
DECEMBER, 1975

LARRY COLLISTER

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION
Robert Nelson
Assistant Superintendent

DEPARTMENT OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY
Mary R. Carson, Director

Prepared by:	Approved by:
Larry Collister	Mary R. Carson
Larry Collister Research Assistant	Mary R. Carson Director

ABSTRACT

In the interval 1970-1975, major policy decisions taken by the School Board establishing District policy on desegregation were the following:

1. November 11, 1970. The Board adopted goals to desegregate the schools.
2. January 27, 1971. The Board implemented its plan to establish multi-racial middle schools.
3. February, 1972. The Board accepted a variety of desegregation plans developed by area citizens' councils and by a District Desegregation Task Force.
4. April 12, 1972. The Board declined to rescind its previous actions of November 1970, and January 1971.
5. April 11, 1973. The Board established the basis for the District's application for Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Title VII funding to support desegregation efforts.
6. June 12, 1974. The Board adopted a plan to desegregate Garfield High School.

The Citizens Committee for Quality Education played a primary role in developing recommendations which the Board used in adopting its original goals in 1970. There was an important response from Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. The Citizens Advisory Councils were important in the development of District policy, although no single advisory council offered a plan which prevailed at the end. The Nixon administration's stand on bussing had an effect on local opinion, as did disturbances at Eckstein and Lincoln. A number of side issues such as free lunches, alternative schools, and child care centers, and the availability of narcotics to school students, tended to cloud the issues in public discussion.

The narrative summarizes the development of District desegregation goals, and ends with a current status report. Appendices contain texts of significant Board resolutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

PRELIMINARY EFFORTS. 1

CONTRIBUTORY THEMES. 2

NARRATIVE OF EVENTS. 3

OTHER COURT ACTIONS. 14

TITLE VII FUNDING CONTROVERSY. 27

APPENDICES 29

NOTES. 35

A NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESEGREGATION GOALS FOR THE SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1970-1975

Sixteen years after Brown v. Board of Education, the Seattle School Board announced formally its intent to end de facto segregation in the Seattle Schools. The purpose of this paper is to give an accounting of the development of the District's desegregation goals in the subsequent five-year period to assist District administrators, Board members, and citizens in assessing the past and to clarify further discussion. The paper is primarily a narrative of events reported in the two leading Seattle newspapers over the period 1970-1975, as they relate to the development of District policy on desegregation.

Preliminary Efforts, 1947-1970.

The Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning (February, 1972) listed a series of Board actions[1] beginning in 1947 with a policy of hiring teachers of different races. Other key actions in the development of the District's desegregation effort prior to 1970 were:

1. Formation of a Voluntary Racial Transfer Program (1963).

2. Appointment of a lay citizens' group to study the complex factors facing the school system and alleviating de facto segregation and solving related problems of children from limited cultural background (1963). The committee's recommendations (1965) have stimulated the preparation and distribution of a comprehensive statement of School District programs and policies with special reference to services for students with culturally different backgrounds and reaffirmation of a commitment to the basic philosophy of providing equal educational opportunities by elimination of racial segregation and achievement of integrated education.

3. Appointment of the Seattle Citizens' School Progress Planning Committee of 100 (1966), to examine a continuous progress center concept. The Committee recommended that quality education in an integrated environment could best be accomplished through development of continuous progress learning centers.

4. Establishment of the Southeast Education Center (1967) to plan and develop learning centers designed to facilitate quality integrated education.

5. Approval (1968) of additional planning for desegregated middle schools and direction to the administration to plan for transition of junior high students to multi-racial middle schools (one by September, 1969, and at least three by September, 1971).

6. Approval of the educational plan of the Central Region (1969) for the formation of eight satellite preschools, an early childhood education center, seven K-4 primary schools, two K-6 schools, one 5-8 middle school, and one 9-12 high school for purposes of providing quality education and racial integration.

A series of efforts, less visible and formal, had been initiated during the last several years to assure continued progress toward achieving quality integrated education for children. For example, a systematic effort was made to recruit classified and certificated minority staff members; special programs were developed to upgrade the performance and skills of all students, but especially of the minority and disadvantaged student; community, intergroup, special education, and other educational specialists were hired and assigned to work with parents, staff and students; educational facilities were planned and developed to support the new programs; and changes in administrative policy were made so that principals, teachers, students, and parents would have more freedom to plan and develop programs for their schools.

Contributory Themes, 1970-1975.

Several themes are developed in the narrative that follows, and taken together, they explain the present stance of the Seattle School District with respect to School desegregation. The major policy decisions taken by the Board were the following:

1. November 11, 1970. The Board adopted goals to desegregate the schools.

2. January 27, 1971. The Board implemented its plan to establish multi-racial middle schools.

3. February, 1972. The Board accepted a variety of desegregation plans developed by area citizens' councils and by a District Desegregation Task Force.

4. April 12, 1972. The Board declined to rescind its previous actions of November, 1970 and January, 1971.

5. April 11, 1973. The Board adopted a timeline for the continuation of its desegregation efforts, establishing the basis for the District's application for Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Title VII funding to support desegregation efforts.

6. June 12, 1974. The Board adopted a plan to desegregate Garfield High School.

An examination of newspaper accounts and of School Board minutes during the period 1970-1975 has indicated the existence of contributory and sometimes conflicting themes in the development of desegregation policy for the Seattle School District.

The Citizens Committee for Quality Education played a primary role in developing recommendations based on citizen input which the Board used in adopting its original goals in 1970. There was an important response from Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. This response took the form of a court injunction, a movement to recall members of the Board, an attempt to remove Superintendent Forbes Bottomly, and an attempt to replace Board members in regular school elections. The Citizens Advisory Councils were important in the development of District policy, although no single advisory council offered a plan which prevailed at the end. The Nixon administration's stand on bussing also had an effect on local opinion. Disturbances at Eckstein and at Lincoln High School influenced public opinion in a significant measure. In addition, there were a number of side issues not directly related to the question of desegregation, but which, nevertheless, influenced people's thinking. Some of these were the question of religion in the schools, free lunches, alternative schools, child care centers, and the availability of narcotics to school students. Opinion on these issues was divided and discussion of these questions tended to become mixed with the broader question of desegregation within the schools.

The remainder of the paper is an account of related events occurring between November, 1970 and November, 1975.

Narrative of Events

Board Adopts Goals. At the special School Board meeting of November 11, 1970, Mrs. Forrest S. Smith, Vice President of the Seattle School Board, read a prepared statement which enunciated the major goals of the Seattle School District with respect to desegregation. She said:

> "The time has come for the next major step forward. Fulfilling a goal established in 1968, we will, in September, 1971, establish a number of multi-racial middle schools that will be the forerunners of comparable 5th through 8th grade programs for all Seattle students at those grade levels.
>
> "Nor does our long-range goal rest there. Beyond the gradual development of multi-racial middle schools we look to the integration of the educational experience for all Seattle students from kindergarten through 12th grade. We earnestly invite the community to join with us in conceiving how that goal shall be attained."[2]

The plan adopted by the Board in November, 1970, called for actions in September, 1971, which would:

a) Desegregate the Meany-Madrona Middle School and

b) Establish multi-racial middle schools in both the Roosevelt and Lincoln attendance areas.

This entailed the movement of approximately 600 students from the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas to middle schools in the Central Area and movement in the other direction of approximately 600 middle school-age students then enrolled in Central Area schools. The Board's intention would have resulted, in the Fall of 1971, in middle school components for 5th and 6th graders at four locations in the Roosevelt-Lincoln area and middle school components for 7th and 8th graders within existing facilities at Wilson, Hamilton, Marshall, and Eckstein Junior High Schools.

The Board invited citizen involvement in developing alternative, workable plans for the first phase of the desegregation program. Plans being initiated by the public were to meet the following criteria:

1. Student population involved would be at the 5th and 8th grade levels.
2. The attendance areas involved would be Lincoln, Roosevelt and Garfield areas.
3. The result would be to desegregate the Meany-Madrona Middle School by September, 1971.
4. The non-white pupil population in each middle school component would range from 15% to 40%.
5. There would be provisions for major community involvement in planning of program, pupil services, and school-parent relations.
6. There would be provisions for educational programs of high quality for all participating students.

The Board's statement emphasized the need for citizen participation beyond the projected implementation date of September, 1971. The Board asked for citizen input to advise them, not only with respect to further steps in multi-racial middle schools throughout the District, but also regarding the measures needed to bring about integration of the other grade levels.

The minutes of November 11, 1970, indicate that Board Member Swain moved the adoption of the statement read by Mrs. Smith as the plan to implement desegregation in the Seattle School District beginning with the 1971-72 school year. When the vote was called, the Board unanimously joined to support the new position on desegregation.

Citizen input. Two organizations were formed by citizens in response to the Board action. One was the Citizens Committee for Quality Education, a self-constituted group of broad citizen interest. The group sought and received School Board sanction to develop recommendations for implementation of Board policy on integration of Seattle Public Schools.

A second group, Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing, appeared and filed in the Superior Court an appeal against the November 11th desegregation decision of the Seattle School Board. They requested the Superior Court specifically to issue an injunction against the School Board enjoining it from implementing its plan to desegregate the schools. The Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing further petitioned the Superior Court for a writ of mandamus to enforce the county election officials to prepare a ballot synopsis for the recall of the Seattle School Board members.[3] An affidavit submitted with the petition stated that the petitioners believed that the Board would embark on a cross-town bussing program under the guise of desegregating the schools, while its true goal, it was stated, was to impose the 4-4-4 plan or middle school plan without informing citizens "until it was too late."

The affidavit charged that the Board intentionally increased the racial imbalance of Meany-Madrona to justify the "desegregation guise leading to middle schools." When it filed the recall charges, the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing (CAMB) also asked for the dismissal of Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent. An an appointed official, Dr. Bottomly was not subject to recall, but could be removed only by the action of the School Board.

Superior Court Judge Stanley C. Soderland ruled that none of the seven misconduct charges against members of the Seattle School Board constituted grounds for recall action.[4] Judge Soderland denied the writ sought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing to force county officials to prepare the charges in a synopsis for recall petitions. Judge Soderland prefaced his ruling by pointing out that elected officials need not account to the voters in a recall election "for each and every policy decision."

Board implements plan. At the Board meeting of January 27, 1971, Board President Smith read a statement[5] entitled "Desegregation of the Seattle Public Schools: The Position of the Seattle School Board." The Board's statement summarized previous actions of the Board, including its decision of November 11, 1970. The statement continued:

> "Following this decision, many citizens of the community stepped forward with support and encouragement. There were others, however, who stated their disagreement in the strongest terms.
>
> "In this setting, the Board appealed to the rational judgment of the citizens for counsel and guidance."

The Board acknowledged many individual plans that had been submitted by citizens' groups, and turned its attention to the major reports submitted by the Citizens Committee for Quality Education (CCQE).

The next major policy statement was made on January 27, 1971, when the School Board set forth these goals for desegregation:

> "The members of the Seattle School Board are fully committed to the proposition that racial segregation in any community is contrary to the basic principles of our society and detrimental to its well-being and that its total elimination must require a continuous effort, employing all of the resources of the community.

> The Board believes further that integrated education will provide better racial understanding among all children and that the responsibility for providing integrated education rests finally with the Board itself.
>
> The Board endorses these propositions and accepts full responsibility for bringing them squarely before the Seattle citizens. The Board recognizes the political implications of the decisions it has made. It understands but does not concur with those who reject the integration goals and the propositions upon which they are founded.
>
> The Seattle School Board will not deviate from its goal for integration of all Seattle schools at the earliest feasible date. It believes that the time has come for all Seattle citizens to join with the Board to expunge from our schools all vestiges of segregation."

In establishing guidelines for the implementation of its goals, the Board stated the following:

> "To achieve desegregation, the School Board has established a racial balance goal of not less than 15% nor more than 25% of any ethnic minority student population in any school. To accomplish this, approximately 1,200 students will be transported with about 600 Central Region students in grades 5-8 assigned to Lincoln-Roosevelt area schools and about the same number of Lincoln-Roosevelt area students to Meany-Madrona."

The Board further urged that parents and teachers of primary schools of the two regions would pair up to establish voluntary exchanges and other procedures under which children and adults would benefit from educational and human relations experiences. The administration was instructed to recommend elementary schools which would be so paired. The School Board accepted the recommendations of the Citizens Committee for Quality Education on curriculum and directed the administration to provide continuous progress education for the schools. It also directed that multi-ethnic education would be a part of the entire curriculum District-wide and that this would be reflected in the textbooks, readers and other resources used in the schools.

The Board also recognized that staffing of the integrated schools must receive careful attention. Therefore, the Board directed the administration to assign to those schools, principals, teachers and other staff who possessed the educational and human relations leadership qualities which would be required. The administration was also directed to assure that the teaching faculties of those schools would be made up of individuals who desired to work in an integrated school and who would take part in programs of training, individualized instruction, continuous progress and multi-ethnic education. All staff members were instructed to take part in human relations programs to insure that all children would be welcomed and educated without prejudice.

The administration was asked to assign a sufficient number of minority personnel to the administrative, counseling, and teaching staffs of each of the schools in order to provide a meaningful balance. The Board recognized that community involvement is a necessary part of the planning process. To obtain this, the administration was directed to establish a steering committee made up of representatives of the Central Area School Council and of the recognized interim advisory councils of the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas pending formation of elected councils in those two areas. The Board directed the administration to keep in close communication with the Citizens Committee for Quality Education, as that committee developed recommendations for subsequent steps. Referring to the plan to establish multi-racial middle schools as "Phase I" of the desegregation plan, the Board stated at its meeting of January 27, 1971:

> "The School Board realizes that the Phase I program is only a first step toward attaining the goal of integrated education for all children. It therefore directs the administration to continue planning for subsequent phases which will reach that goal. ...It is the Board's goal to have eliminated racial segregation in the Lincoln-Roosevelt-Garfield areas of Seattle Public Schools by September, 1972, and de facto segregation throughout the district by 1973."

On January 27, 1971, the Board implemented its desegregation policy by adopting Resolution 1971-3 Concerning Desegregation and Integration of Seattle School District No. 1. The Resolution, contained in Appendix A of this report, p. 29, provided for the exchange of students at the middle school level between the Lincoln-Roosevelt area and the Meany-Madrona area. It provided that continuous progress education should be a part of the curriculum for the middle schools. The resolution addressed the problem of staffing the middle schools, and provided for a planning steering committee. In answering questions from the public, the Board indicated it would finance transportation of students required in the plan with state funding as other transportation of students previously had been done. Students would be assigned to schools, and would not be accepted except at the schools to which they were assigned.

CCQE Report: June, 1971. The report of the Citizens Committee for Quality Education of June, 1971, developed recommendations for the cultural and structural integration of the Seattle Public Schools.[6] This report was presented to the School Board at its meeting of July 22, 1971. A minority report was filed along with the majority report. The minority report contained the statement that "the School Board should recognize the imbalance of CCQE membership. This caused many members of the community, and organizations, to feel a sense of futility, and they dropped out feeling their efforts would not be needed."

The minority report stated the hope that the committee would not have spent seven months of long meetings only to have their report ignored. The report, addressed to the question of desegregation, nevertheless suggested that it was inconsistent to assign pupils mandatorily for desegregation while students would be allowed to move to alternative schools, such as Nova, Free School, etc. Objections were entered in the minority report to the concept of continuous progress and individualized instruction. The minority report stated "It is to be noted by the Board the number of individuals signing or supporting the minority report were elected to citizens advisory councils. On the other hand, it must be noted that many of those writing the majority report are not elected, but supposedly represent organizations and yet have consistently spoken strictly for themselves."

Cultural and structural integration. Of far reaching importance were two concepts identified in the CCQE report of June, 1971. These were the ideas of cultural and structural integration. Cultural integration refers to a situation in a school in which all staff and students acquire an understanding and respect for the history, cultural heritage and contributions of all ethnic groups so that there is mutual respect and cultural sharing. A culturally integrated school is one in which children of all ethnic groups not only have an equal opportunity to acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors necessary to be effective persons but are, in fact, demonstrating these characteristics. Structural integration refers to a situation in a school in which the staff members, students and parents of all ethnic groups hold statuses and roles in the social structure of the school which are equivalent to those statuses occupied by members of other ethnic groups.

Citizens' councils. The Central Area School Council was formed after talks between Central Area citizens and the Seattle School Board. These discussions, which began in 1968, led to a document described as "Agreements and understandings reached between representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee on Central Area education and the Seattle School District." The agreements provided for the election of the Central Area School Council, and established formal relationships of the Council to the School Board, to the Superintendent of Schools, area administrators, the community, teachers, and students. The first Council was elected in April, 1969.

In April, 1971, the Superintendent established Guidelines for Citizens School Advisory Councils. The Guidelines specifically include the Central Area School Advisory Council as a recognized and duly-elected Council. Councils were formed for each of the high school attendance areas.

Court injunction. Superior Court Judge William J. Wilkins later enjoined the Seattle School Board from proceeding with its desegregation program for one year. The injunction was handed down on August 10, 1971.[7] The decision also enjoined the Board from bussing involuntarily any child to a school other than to his neighborhood school or the one he had been attending during the previous school year. Judge Wilkins agreed with the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing that the School Board was arbitrary in the way it arrived at the desegregation plan announced November, 1970. The School District announced that it would appeal the decision to the State Supreme Court. At that point all of the schools had been restaffed for the desegregation plan. New principals had been named for the middle schools. Hundreds of hours of teacher workshops, voluntary summer schools and summer camps, parent human relations training and other work had been financed during the summer, financed by about $750,000 in federal money.[8]

Bussing - a national issue. On August 11, 1971, the Associated Press carried a story which indicated the extent of federal involvement in the bussing question.

> "The White House said today that President Nixon has directed federal agencies within the past month to seek school desegregation without bussing and indicated that heads will fall if its desires are ignored.
>
> Ronald L. Ziegler, Press Secretary, told reporters that in the past there have been times when members of the Federal bureaucracy have not been responsive to White House views. 'They're going to be responsive,' he said, 'and those who are not responsive will find themselves involved in other assignments or quite possibly an assignment other than the Federal government.'
>
> Mr. Nixon insisted that school desegregation be carried out wherever possible without bussing youngsters for long distances from their homes. The United States Supreme Court, however, has ruled that bussing is legal.
>
> Governor George Wallace of Alabama sent a telegram to the President yesterday saying Mr. Nixon should support its ban against bussing by asking Federal Courts to reverse themselves and hold it unconstitutional."[9]

Other newspaper accounts [10] indicated a division of public opinion on the question of free school lunches, one of many issues that became entangled in the desegregation question.

The Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing endorsed three candidates[11] for the School Board election. The action was taken in September, 1971. Delwin Chafe and Allan Anderson were among those endorsed by CAMB; Chafe was subsequently elected to the Board.

Problems at Garfield High School. The Central Area School Council was told in late August that school officials may be compounding the problem of declining enrollment at Garfield High School and intensifying suspicion that school may be closed--by refusing to build a learning resource center there. The refusal to build a resource center was one component of a vicious circle which, it was said, was draining Garfield of students. Dr. Roland N. Patterson, Central Region Assistant Superintendent, cited loopholes in regulations allowing transfers out of Garfield as one problem. One such loophole, he said, was a regulation allowing a student to transfer to another school if the course he wanted to take was not offered at his own school. The Council also expressed concern that small numbers of Central Area black students transferring into north end middle schools under the voluntary bussing program would cause the transferring blacks to "lose identity." Before the School Board's mandatory bussing plan was stopped (by court injunction) the Central Area School Council requested a 40% black enrollment in integrated schools. The Citizens Committee for Quality Education, advising the School Board, has recommended a balance of 80% white and 20% non-whites throughout the city.[12]

Problems at Eckstein Middle School. Reports appearing in the newspapers[13] toward the end of September, 1971, indicate the existence of problems connected with the opening of the Eckstein Middle School. The Seattle Teachers' Association called conditions there "chaotic." An article in the Post-Intelligenc[illegible][14] for October, 1971, stated:

> "A packed house of 700 parents registered their discontent with recent events at troubled Nathan Eckstein Middle School last night....Parents voiced concern over overcrowding, lack of books, ungraded learning programs and the absence of letter grades."

David E. Wagoner, Board member, was quoted in the October 14, 1971 Seattle Times, saying that the School Board must make "frank admissions of some administrative failures" over Eckstein Middle School.[15]

The newspaper account described the action of about 40 pickets sponsored by the Roosevelt area Citizens School Advisory Council, standing outside the School District Administrative Building before the Board meeting with signs calling for Council control of the school.

The school, with 1750 students, had been a scene of rumors of racial strife two weeks before. Nothing serious happened, however....Wagoner also said the situation was "back on the track" and called for community support and a breathing spell to allow the school to function. He also suggested that the media had "put the problem completely out of context." "How often do we see the media tell about the good things going on? I think we are entitled to a more balanced presentation," he said. Wagoner also scored the "attitude of the Seattle Teachers' Association" and the "largely negative position of the Roosevelt Council."

Neil Shulman, Roosevelt Council chairman, charged that the administration attempted to "cover up or at least cloud the situation out there. If anything, I would say that the situation is worse than the press has indicated. We were proud of Eckstein--we were proud of the educational standards there. Our pleas fell on deaf ears."

Problems at Lincoln High School. Nine major causes of the racial unrest which resulted in fighting at Lincoln High School (during the week of October 20, 1971) were listed by Alfred E. Cowles, Executive Director of the State Human Rights Commission.[16] Mr. Cowles suggested, among other things, that there had been a lack of preparation for voluntary racial transfers to Lincoln High School. He said this stemmed in part from a lack of recognition of the depth of white racism in that community.

Attacks on Superintendent Bottomly. A letter from a reader to the editor of the Times said[17] "You can hardly pick up a paper or turn on the television these days without encountering carping against School Superintendent Forbes Bottomly."

J. Ben Nickerson, Board candidate running against incumbent Richard J. Alexander, was quoted on October 26, 1971, saying "I have no faith in Bottomly any more. I would definitely try to have him replaced because I have lost confidence in him and thousands of parents have." The Times[18] quoted Nickerson as saying that a big victory for Nickerson and for Delwin R. Chafe, who was opposing Dr. Edward P. Palmason, the other incumbent up for reelection, "would be a mandate for the rest of the Board members to listen to the people."

Injunction and public debate. With the opening of school in the fall of 1971, the mandatory assignment of students to middle schools had been restrained by court injunction. To the extent that Seattle Schools were desegregated, it was accomplished on the basis of a voluntary racial transfer program. Difficulties at Eckstein, Lincoln and Garfield have been mentioned above.

An indication of the depth of emotion experienced at this time is indicated by a story in the Seattle Times[19] of October 28, 1971, describing the burning of a wooden cross in front of a private home in Bellevue.

Discussion occurred in many forms around the city. A sample of the content of those discussions may be inferred by examination of a few headlines in the November, 1971 Seattle newspapers:

VOLUNTEERS SOUGHT FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL RUMOR CONTROL UNIT
BETTER SCHOOL STAFF HUMAN RELATIONS URGED
CLEVELAND GROUP ASKS AID FOR IMMIGRANT STUDENTS
BOY IN CUSTODY AFTER ASSAULT AT SCHOOL
CRISIS STUDY URGED FOR SCHOOL AIDES
HOUSE SHOWDOWN DUE ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
VOUCHER PLAN IN SCHOOLS DEFENDED AS HELP FOR POOR
BOTTOMLY OPPOSES ETHNIC POLICIES FOR SCHOOLS
PROTEST OR NO, MAPLE SCHOOL WILL REOPEN
DECISION TO EXPEL TROUBLEMAKERS SEEN AS FADING AWAY OF OLD DREAMS
SAN FRANCISCO MOTHER STABS TWO TEACHERS IN CLASS
CENTRAL AREA SCHOOL COUNCIL URGES HUGE LEVY
WEST SEATTLE GROUP FAVORS LOW LEVY
BOSTON SCHOOLS FACE RIGHTS SUIT
CONGRESS OKAYS CHILD CARE PLAN, VETO THREATENED
NIXON VETOES GIANT CHILD CARE PROGRAM

Delwin R. Chafe defeated Dr. Edward Palmason in the November school election. Chafe had opposed mandatory bussing and had received the endorsement of the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. Like most challengers he had attacked the School Board's record as deficient, especially for giving support to Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Seattle School Superintendent, on making education changes.[20] Bottomly is the man whom Palmason had praised as one of the best educators in America.

The public discussions of the desegregation issue reached into the Parent-Teacher-Student Association. In mid-December of 1971, the Seattle Council of the PTSA celebrated its 50th anniversary with a lunch and debate on recommendations for desegregating schools.[21] Debate on the recommendations was anticipated to be stormy, for the wording implicitly recognized the mandatory nature of the Seattle School Board's integration plans. These plans had been halted at least temporarily by court actions. The PTSA had never stated opposition or support for School District integration plans prior to that time.

One citizen, said to be speaking bluntly for himself,[22] declared that if a voluntary program was not socially and educationally acceptable to the majority of the people in Seattle then a mandatory program would be equally unacceptable and should not be foisted upon an unwilling public.

Washington law provides for the recall of elected officials. The law requires signatures to petitions which specify charges against the officials to be recalled. Legal procedure, at least in theory, presumes misconduct of the official(s), rather than public whim, to be the basis of recall action.

Recall drive. The State Supreme Court in Olympia, on January 6, 1972, ordered the King County Superior Court to permit circulation of recall petitions by the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing against the members of the Seattle School Board.[23] Named in the recall petitions were Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Mrs. Forrest Smith, Phillip Swain, David Wagoner, and Alfred E. Cowles. Two other members named in the original action had stood for reelection in November. Dr. E. P. Palmason had been defeated by Delwin R. Chafe, and Richard J. Alexander was reelected, making him immune to this recall action. Superior Court Judge Soderland had refused to issue ballot synopses for the petitions in February, 1971. The CAMB appeal had been argued before the Supreme Court in May, 1971. The first charge upheld by the majority of the State Supreme Court was that the Board retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent, although, in the words of the recall petition, he was "unqualified as evidenced by the steady decline in the quality of education." The Court stated "the charge may ultimately prove to be unfounded, even frivolous, but courts are not empowered to make that determination." The second charge the majority upheld was that the School Board members, "knowingly and officially established de jure racial segregation," particularly in the Meany and Madrona schools. Justice Marshall Neill wrote, "the charge states violation of constitutional rights, and if true, would support recall."

Mandatory bussing was not a proper ground for recall of the Seattle School Board, the Supreme Court ruled. Justice Neill referred to a United States Supreme Court decision in the Swann-Mechlenburg case. In that case, the United States Supreme Court upheld a court ordered desegregation plan which incorporated mandatory bussing in a southern school district which was infected with de jure racial segregation. The highest court had rejected the notion that school authorities cannot consider the race of students in formulating and implementing desegregation plans.

Central Area School Council. Alfred E. Cowles, black School Board member, on January 6, 1972, angrily declared he would never vote to rescind the Board's negotiated agreement with the Central Area School Council.[24] Cowles' statement came near the end of the three and one-half hour Board meeting which began with desegregation recommendations by ten of the twelve area citizen school advisory councils and ended with the discussion of council guidelines which took on racial overtones. The Seattle Times described the guidelines controversy as an issue ever since the eleven additional councils had been formed in May of 1971 to join the then, three-year old Central Area School Council.

Unlike the CASC agreement, the guidelines governing the eleven new councils were determined by the administration. They differed on some specifics from the Central Area agreement. One bone of contention had been that the CASC had refused to participate in District council meetings because of legal advice that to do so might jeopardize its unique position. Cowles' declaration came in response to remarks by citizen Neal Shulman who said "the Board is bound legally and morally to treat each of those advisory councils on an equal basis... so that each and every council will have the same power, the same authority and the same responsibility in its relationships with that Board."

Cowles shot back that minorities are "tired of people choosing where they're willing to apply equality." He said the conditions in the Central Area where he resides are unequal.

Cowles said that in the historical context in which the Central Area residents negotiated their agreement with the Board, such an arrangement was necessary to restore the credibility between that community and the Board.

He added, "Any trust that now exists between that community and the school system hinges on that very fragile document...that you are willing to change so quickly... what's at stake in that fragile piece of paper represents the racial tranquility of the climate of the Central Area and its communication with this particular school board."

Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Board President, said, "I personally think it's wrong that we have this bickering that has been going on all these many months since the councils have been formed."

Descriptive of the discussion in public forums during January, 1972, were the following headlines from Seattle newspapers:

CENTRAL AREA GROUP WANTS MORE CONTROL OVER SCHOOLS
QUEEN ANNE COUNCIL OK'S PLAN FOR SCHOOLS
SCHOOL BOARD TO STUDY COURT'S RECALL RULING
COURT CLEARS SCHOOL BOARD RECALL TRY
FLORIDA SPEECH: JACKSON TELLS BUSSING VIEW
BALLARD SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCIL ENDORSES DESEGREGATION REPORT
SEGREGATION RISING IN SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Recall issue. Arguments were presented on January 11, 1972, by attorneys for the Seattle School Board in an appeal against the ruling of the previous August. Superior Court Judge Wilkins had permanently enjoined the District from mandatory transfers and delayed multi-racial middle schools for a year. The case had been brought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing.[25] Attorneys for CAMB said the chief question is "whether neighborhood schools are a property right in this country and whether parents have the primary duty and right and control over the education of the child."

Justice Stafford asked Kennedy (attorney for CAMB) to cite specific court cases where property rights include the right to neighborhood schools. Kennedy said he could not because the issue never had been argued before in the courts.

Kennedy further argued that the real problem of desegregation involves socioeconomic conditions which a simple "mixing of certain percentages of children will not solve."

The Seattle Times reports that in mid-January, School Board members were facing recall action.[26] Board member David E. Wagoner stated "we must respect last week's State Supreme Court ruling allowing the recall attempt to proceed." Wagoner, an attorney, was seconded by the other members facing recall: Tidwell, Swain, Cowles and Mrs. Forrest Smith. Wagoner said that the Board members were willing to take the risk of a recall in their desegregation decision, but the charges against Bottomly are fundamentally unfair...A truly outstanding school Superintendent is a rare commodity, particularly in big city schools, and that is precisely what we have in Seattle in the person of Forbes Bottomly."

Wagoner said a vote would clear the air. He said he only asked that the real issue be faced. "Are we going to allow black children and white children to go to school together," he said. "The issue is as simple as that--it's an educational issue--it's a moral issue--let us have the courage to do what is right." Alexander, originally named in the action but immune because of his reelection in November said, "The charges are completely false, but recall will give voters a vehicle other than a levy election to express themselves."

Other Court Actions

Superintendent Bottomly's plan for desegregating the schools had been held in abeyance because of the Superior Court's injunction. The School District in January, 1972, was waiting a decision on its appeal to the State Supreme Court. Dates set for decision by the School Board to implement the second phase of the desegregation plan had been postponed from February 23, to March 8, then to March 22, March 29 and finally April 12, 1972; during this period the Board's intent crystallized. Leadership in the national government was not in agreement on the issue. For example, the United States Senate took action to strip courts of power to order bussing of children in school desegregation cases.[27]

The Seattle Times, in a feature[28] written at the end of February, stated that the rise of bussing as a national political issue can be traced to three court decisions: the United States Supreme Court's ruling in a Charlotte, North Carolina case in April of 1971, upholding bussing as a means of desegregating the schools; a Federal District Court ruling in September, 1971, that schools in Detroit were unconstitutionally segregated; and a Federal District Court ruling in January, 1972, ordering a consolidation of the 70% black school system in Richmond, Virginia, with the 90% white systems in its two suburban counties. The Times added that Nixon's repudiation of his administration's own desegregation plan for Austin, Texas, in August, 1971, spotlighted the political impact of bussing.

In mid-January the United States Supreme Court agreed to rule for the first time on the bussing of school children to reduce segregation in large cities outside the South.[29] The action was brought to the United States Supreme Court from a case in Denver, Colorado

Citizens' proposals. In response to the Board's invitation of November, 1970, position papers and detailed proposals for desegregation plans were submitted to the Board by more than a dozen citizen groups. These proposals represented an enormous effort by hundreds of people.

Chairpersons and the organizations they represented were: Diane Palmer (Central Area School Council); Ellen Roe (North Region Council, whose members resided in the Ballard, Hale, Ingraham, Lincoln and Roosevelt areas); George J. Burmeister (Ballard Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Ellen Roe (Nathan Hale Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Ray W. Dickhaut (Ingraham Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Kent Kammerer (Lincoln Area Citizens School Advisory Council); Neal J. Shulman (Roosevelt Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Earl Mills (Cleveland Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Nancy Thomas (Franklin Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); Joe A. Taller (Queen Anne Area Citizens' School Advisory Council); David Morris, Jr. (Southeast Education Center Citizens' Committee); Jim Gifford (Chief Sealth Citizens' School Advisory Council); Kay Trepanier (West Seattle Citizens' School Advisory Council); and Jean Ulrich (Seattle Parent-Teacher-Student Association).

Other proposals and reports of special significance which the Board had received were developed by the Citizens; Committee for Quality Education, Dr. David G. Colwell, Chairman; the Washington State Board of Education and Washington State Board Against Discrimination; Citizens' Staff Human Relations Task Force, Timmie Faghin and Mildred German, Co-chairpersons; North Central Schools Project, Forney Knox, Chairman.

Task Force on Desegregation Planning. Each of the groups mentioned in the preceding section were invited to present their proposals to the School Board and to meet with staff administrators and planners to further explore the parameters of their proposals. The Superintendent appointed a Task Force on Desegregation Planning to analyze all reports or statements submitted and to present a recommendation.

Members of the Task Force were: Henry Caldwell, Coordinator, Desegregation Planning; James Farris, Specialist, Facilities Technology; Dale Goss, Director, Planning and Evaluation; Mike Hanegan, Population Analyst; Jay Iman, Evaluator; Elmo Little, Supervisor, Instructional Systems Development; and Harold Reasby, Supervisor, Research and Evaluation.

The Task Force presented its report[30] to the Board in February, 1972. The report contained an analysis of each proposal advanced by citizen groups and set forth a proposal of its own. The report, if adopted, would have ended voluntary transfers.[31]

Board efforts to resolve questions. In March, 1972, then, the Board was awaiting the outcome of an appeal to the Washington State Supreme Court on the order of the Superior Court enjoining the District not to implement its mandatory student assignment plan. Public debate on that question had been long and intense. More than a dozen citizen groups had submitted separate proposals on January 6, 1972 to desegregate the schools. The Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation planning had analyzed the citizen proposals and had presented its own recommendation. The Board's timetable called for a decision on March 8. Pending before the Supreme Court was a question, brought by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing, whether the charges against Board incumbents were indeed adequate to justify recall, if true. Newspaper reports show Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, Board President, attempted to stick to the original goal of March 8 for the Board to adopt a desegregation plan. The Seattle School Board did meet on March 8, 1972. The Board minutes show that Resolution 1972-3 had been introduced and discussion followed. The Resolution stated, in part:

> "WHEREAS significant educational research has indicated the detrimental effect that racial isolation has on educational achievement; and WHEREAS this research has also indicated the positive effect of integrated education on children from racial or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups;...NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Board go on record as indicating that it will implement at least the first phase of a total desegregation plan in September, 1972, subject to the restrictions of the Honorable William J. Wilkins, unless those restrictions are to vacate it or supercede it."

The Board minutes indicate that the resolution was not passed and further discussion of the resolution was postponed until the next regular meeting. However, there was no mention of the resolution in the Board minutes of March 15, 1972. The minutes of March 22, 1972, indicate that there had been a motion to delay the mandatory desegregation decision until a decision was handed down by the Washington State Supreme Court and that the School Board use the time to meet and confer with all citizen-elected councils to improve communication and secure meaningful input and request technical assistance from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Seattle Times[32], in reporting the Board meeting of March 22, indicated that the School Board was split on desegregation 4 to 3. Mrs. Forrest Smith, Board President, is quoted as saying, "I would be uncomfortable taking action while an injunction is upon us." She said that was why she had supported a motion the previous day to do no planning on any mandatory desegregation programs until the State Supreme Court ruled on a Superior Court injunction against mandatory student reassignments here. Hers had been the key vote in the 4 to 3 decision. Mrs. Smith had been absent Monday, March 20, from the Board meeting where a split for going ahead or delaying became apparent.

Dr. Forbes Bottomly, Superintendent, had told the Board that time practically had run out for his staff to prepare to put into operation even the middle school desegregation plan delayed by Wilkins' court order and only one or two schools pairing for voluntary desegregation. Bottomly told newsmen that he was disappointed that the Board could not eradicate segregation. He said the Board knew his views over the past six years but the decision was up to them. Board members Richard J. Alexander and Delwin R. Chafe joined Cowles and Mrs. Smith in voting for the motion. Three Board members, Dr. Robert A. Tidwell, President, Philip B. Swain, and David E. Wagoner, voted against the motion. Board member Philip Swain said: "We've been involved in the process of talking and talking and talking and meeting and meeting and meeting and conferring and conferring and conferring and sometime you have to bring this process to a head." The Board had considered but took no action on a tabled resolution that had been presented on March 8, that the Board go ahead with the first phase of a total desegregation plan in September, 1972. Board member Alexander who had presented the motion said that he was convinced that only a federal court ordered desegregation could unify the city.

Cowles told fellow Board members that they had not listened to minority community concerns and he asked General Counsel Little if the Board could undo the delayed middle school desegregation.

Little said that the Board could do so, but he also warned of the "ratchet theory" used in federal cases involving Denver. The theory is that, like a ratchet wrench, once it moves forward, it cannot go backwards. Little explained later that the Board having moved to desegregate Meany-Madrona, would have to do something to continue that, although it would not necessarily have to involve those three middle schools in the delayed plan.

John de Yonge, writing in a March, 1972, issue of the Post-Intelligencer, stated that mandatory school desegregation -- and thus, bussing -- in Seattle that fall was then all but ruled out.[33] He wrote that the Seattle School Board voted 4 to 3 to delay a decision on mandatory desegregation--virtually guaranteeing that no child would be required to leave his heighborhood school the next year.

After the vote, Board member Swain said the Board was shirking its duty to desegregate schools here, and he prepared a motion to have the Board state that if volunteerism fails to desegregate the elementary schools next year, the Board would order mandatory desegregation the year after.[34] Swain withdrew his motion, however, when he was advised in private that if the Board turned down his motion on split vote it would make moot the Board's appeal of the local court order to the State Supreme Court.

At the conclusion of the meeting Dr. Robert A. Tidwell stated, "I had a speech prepared but I'll make this short. I resign as of now. The meeting is adjourned." Tidwell had voted with members Wagoner and Swain to continue mandatory school desegregation in recent 4 to 3 school board votes and told newsmen who met him as he left the board table, "I am through--I have just had it. I am tired of this constant bickering." The Post-Intelligencer stated that Tidwell had been known for being outspoken, and had suffered two heart attacks during his Board service but had shrugged off questions about his health. Tidwell did note that the Board was expected to meet constantly, in part to be vilified by persons opposing Board policy. He had stressed that he had been particularly frustrated over what he considered to be the bickering on a problem, desegregation. He stated that there was no question about how it should be solved.

Tidwell's resignation would change the lineup on the School Board. It remained uncertain how the resignation would affect the standing 4 to 3 Board split on desegregation questions.

Court decisions. The Washington State Supreme Court[35] dissolved a ban against mandatory desegregation and mandatory bussing in Seattle on April 6, 1972. The Court ruling said in part, "We find no authority in law for the proposition that parents have a vested right to send their children to, or that children have a vested right to attend, any particular public school."

Ballot synopses in the School Board recall attempt by the Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing were released on April 7, 1972. CAMB brought seven original charges against the Board to support recall. The State Supreme Court allowed two to remain. The synopses reflect those charges.[36] One said that the members involved "retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent...knowing that Dr. Forbes Bottomly is unqualified to carry out the duties of such a position." The second stated that the members "knowingly established and imposed racial segregation of students within the said school district and particularly in the Meany and Madrona schools thereof." Release of the ballot symopses cleared the way for CAMB to get the necessary signatures to force a recall election.

On the same day in which synopses of School Board recall charges were released, Dr. Forbes Bottomly said that the mandatory middle school desegregation plan would go ahead in the fall unless he was countermanded by the School Board.[37]

"I am assuming," Bottomly said, "that the decison that the School Board made in November, 1970, and January, 1971, is still in effect and has not been rescinded, and the direction to me is pretty clear. The injunction has been lifted and we'll move ahead with our planning to get the middle school desegregation going next fall." When asked to comment, Del R. Chafe, the most recently elected Board member stated, "It certainly doesn't change my position. We have heard pretty clearly from the Roosevelt Council and the Central Area Council that they are not going to participate. It is my fervent hope that this Board will reanalyze its position and try to make the voluntary thing go, but it's a hope only."

At its regular meeting on April 12, 1972, the School Board[38] heard General Counsel Gary M. Little discuss the unanimous decision of the Washington State Supreme Court reversing and dismissing Judge Wilkins' earlier opinion on the case brought against the School District by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. Director Chafe requested counsels' opinion concerning the Board's posture regarding the Meany-Madrona Middle School desegregation plan and the voluntary desegregation plan approved by the Board in pairing of elementary schools in the fall of 1972.

Mr. Little pointed out that the School Board had acted on November 11, 1970, and again on January 27, 1971, to adopt a desegregation plan for the middle schools, grades 5 to 8. The Board subsequently dropped the fifth grade from the plan, which included mandatory reassignment between Meany-Madrona and the Eckstein, Hamilton, and Wilson Middle Schools. Implementation of the plan was stopped by issuance of the injunction by Judge Wilkins, and its dissolution, Little said, leaves the original desegregation plan for multi-racial middle schools as effective school policy. The elementary school voluntary transfer plan adopted on March 29, 1972, was not a part of the lawsuit, Little stated.

Superintendent Bottomly stated that the District could mount the middle school program for the fall of 1972 since most of the planning had been completed the previous year and he had requested the staff to concentrate on the remaining details.

Mr. Chafe then moved that "this Board reconsider the decision of November, 1970, concerning the mandatory program for the middle schools." Board member Cheryl Bleakney questioned whether reconsideration of this whole issue would put the Board in any legal jeopardy. Mr. Little pointed out that in his opinion the School Board should not do anything that would resegregate or add to the segregation of any school, and would have to give careful consideration to the efforts of any change of previously adopted policy. Further, when the Board adopted the multi-racial middle school plan, it applied for and received federal funding in the amount of $1.5 million of which about half had already been spent in preparation of the first phase of the plan. The third facet was that a group of parents had accused the Board (with a case then pending in Federal Court) of deliberately segregating the Meany-Madrona Middle School, so that any action taken by the Board which resulted in de jure segregation of Meany-Madrona would have an effect on the case. It might also be considered malfeasance, Little added.

The motion made by Mr. Chafe was dropped for lack of a second.

Discussion at the Board meeting moved then to planning for the middle school desegregation. Mrs. Diane Palmer, Chairman, Central Area School Council, read a prepared statement iterating that Council's support of its proposed desegregation-education plan and its feeling that the School Board had not adequately considered the needs of the Central Area, resulting in the CASC's decision to encourage its community not to participate in any desegregation plan proposed by the Seattle School Board.

President Cowles expressed his concern and that of the entire Board that the various sections of the City had not offered the kind of support needed to make any plan successful. He pointed out that the Board had always been acutely aware that its members bore the final responsibility for making a decision and the Board's desire for meeting and discussing proposals with all groups. He said that the Board today is informing the administration of its intent to follow through on decisions made a year and a half ago, having not availed itself of a motion to reconsider that decision.

On September 6, 1972, classes began in the four desegregated middle schools, thus completing the first phase of a long-range plan to provide quality, integrated education for students in the Seattle Public Schools.[39]

Recall movement. February 6, 1973, was the date set for the special levy election and for the election to decide the question whether Board members Wagoner, Smith, Cowles, and Swain should be recalled. Forces behind the recall movement had stated that the movement was being sponsored in an effort to rid the Board of Bottomly supporters in order to accomplish the discharge of Bottomly. An editorial in the Post-Intelligencer (February 1, 1973) stated:

> "Instead of massive court orders to desegregate, Seattle students are involved in a thoughtful, orderly process of racial integration. Everyone should understand that the beginnings of the recall effort came as a result of the Board's policy of peaceful, mandatory bussing, an issue which the courts would not allow on the ballot. It should be a matter of pride here that Seattle is the largest major city that is desegregated on its own, without a court order.
>
> "The nature of the campaign waged on behalf of recall has been negative and destructive and if it succeeds could open Seattle to strife and tension."

A substantial number of members of the School Advisory Councils were involved in the recall movement, according to an article by Constantine Angelos.[40] Sixty-seven members of elected Citizen School Advisory Councils, acting as individuals, had signed a statement supporting the recall of four Seattle School Board members in Tuesday's election, PRO announced. PRO (People for Responsive Officials) was the group organized to promote the recall instituted by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing. It was headed by the chairmen of six of the councils.

"The arrogant defiance by Forbes Bottomly and the Seattle School Board of the clearly expressed will of the people of Seattle has produced the reaction by the public that has crystallized into the formation of PRO," the statement said.

The statement said the "ordinary citizen" is fed up with ballooning school budgets, bungled attempts to implement new, untested methods of teaching, declining achievement levels, and an admitted change in emphasis in the schools from education to social reform.

A sample recall ballot was printed in the Seattle Times, February 4, 1973. It is quoted here in full:

RECALL BALLOT NUMBER ONE
BALLOT SYNOPSIS OF RECALL CHARGE AGAINST ALFRED E. COWLES

> "Alfred E. Cowles, as a member of the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1, committed acts of misfeasance, malfeasance or violation of oath of office in the following particulars: 1) Acting in concert with other members of said Board, he has retained Dr. Forbes Bottomly as Superintendent of said School District knowing that Dr. Forbes Bottomly is unqualified to carry out the duties of such position. 2) Acting in concert with other members of said Board, he has knowingly established and imposed racial segregation of students within said School District and particularly to the Meany and Madrona schools thereof."

The recall drive had been initiated by Citizens Against Mandatory Bussing on January 19, 1971, against all seven members then on the Board.[41] Since that time Dr. Edward P. Palmason had been defeated for reelection in the fall of 1971. R. J. Alexander became immune to the recall by being reelected, and Dr. Robert A. Tidwell resigned from the Board in March, 1972.

In an attempt to derail mandatory racial desegregation, CAMB originally brought seven charges against Board members. In January, 1972, the State Supreme Court threw out five of seven charges, all dealing with mandatory bussing and desegregation. The Court said the United States Supreme Court decisions showed that the School Board had the authority to desegregate schools, using mandatory bussing, if necessary.

Although none of the Board members were recalled in the election of February, 1973, the victory for the incumbent Board members may not be termed decisive. Superintendent Forbes Bottomly subsequently tendered his resignation.

Provision for federal funding, Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act. In April, 1973, the Board adopted Resolution 1973-4 in order to utilize funds available as a result of legislation contained in Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act for establishing the program base, staff training, and voluntary participation commitment necessary for further expansion of the Board's desegregation efforts.

The resolution, basically a summary of the Board's previous actions, nevertheless constituted an important statement of the Board's goals on desegregation. These included:

- Continuing the middle school desegregation program
- Continuing the voluntary racial transfer program
- Continuing multi-ethnic and human relations programs for staff, community and students
- Expanding the District's effort to remediate basic skills deficiencies which may exist in low income and minority schools
- Encouraging the return of white Central Area residents and voluntary transfer of other white students to Central Area schools
- Eliminating or reducing the minority isolation in South Region schools through voluntary transfers
- Reassessing the success of various strategies for overcoming segregation in Seattle Schools and determining procedures in 1974-75 for completely eliminating minority group isolation during the 1975-76 school year.

Resolution 1973-4, adopted April 11, 1973, is contained in Appendix B, p. 33.

The desegregation of Garfield High School. As outlined earlier in this paper, the Citizens Committee for Quality Education (CCQE) had presented its report on June 23, 1971, to the Seattle School Board. The Board met again on July 14, 1971, to hear a fuller discussion from all segments of the City including the area councils. Of particular significance to the action taken by the Board in June, 1974, in desegregating Garfield High School, was the statement of the Central Area School Council read at the July 14, 1971, School Board meeting. The statement read by Larry Gossett reads in part,

> "We, however, completely reject the CCQE recommendation of June, 1971, to disperse the children of minority races throughout the schools of Seattle so that they nowhere exceed 20% of any school's enrollment.
>
> "We are particularly concerned with the black children of Seattle. The history of the education of black children in Seattle is a story of virtually unmitigated neglect. In the past two years through the efforts of the Central Area community working with the decentralized school administration, the previous neglect has been transformed into an effective concern. It has demonstrated that black children in predominantly black schools can achieve. We now fear that the progress and the education of black children just begun will be negated by an integration program which, however, well intentioned, is based on the premise that a school of 21% black children is segregated and undesirable while a school of 80% white children is integrated and desirable.

> "The special situation of the black minority in a predominantly white culture requires an unusual extent of black community control over the education of black children. Erosion of this control in past years is evident in the closing of Central Area schools and implementation of a voluntary transfer program that is overwhelmingly out of the Central Area. We recognize and deplore continuing moves that diminish black control of black education in the form of threats to close Garfield and the CCQE proposal that seeks to disperse black children throughout the city.
>
> "With these considerations in mind we offer the School Board the following proposals in the belief that the dual causes of education and integration would be served by their adoption."

The suggestions contained in the CCQE proposal were to strengthen the Central Area education program by upgrading existing facilities and constructing new educational facilities within the Central Area, via continuing support of the Central Area School Council and the Central Area School Administration; by terminating the program of voluntary transfer out of the Central Area and its implicit condemnation of Central Area's schools as second rate with the consequent deprivation of Central Area schools of sufficient students to develop optimal educational programs at all levels; and for encouraging voluntary transfer into Central Area schools. Mr. Gossett stated that the primary concern of Central Area citizens is that they do not want black children spread out all over the city.

Dr. Mike Hickey, Associate Superintendent for Instruction, Seattle School District, expressed concern about the apparent position of the District with regard to further school desegregation.[42] In an April, 1974, Recommendation of the Instructional Division for Further Desegregation of the Seattle Schools he stated that this concern stemmed from several factors: 1) The failure of the District to demonstrate further movement toward desegregation since the inception of the mandatory reassignment program in the fall of 1972. This decision (or nondecision) was presumably based on the perceived need for "settling in" to assess progress and to consolidate gains made thus far, 2) there had been a retrogression in District progress toward desegregation due to a variety of factors, including the increased influx of minority students into the District, movement of minorities within the District, and a falling off of voluntary transfers, particularly minority youngsters, as they return to Central Area schools, 3) an overriding concern in all of this was the possibility of a lawsuit which would force a court ordered total mandatory desegregation of the entire District if actions, or the lack of actions, were to be interpreted as segregation or as an inadequate manifestation of commitment to voluntary desegregation of our schools. The recommendations (sometimes referred to as "the Hickey report") contained suggestions for long-range development of modified "magnet" schools or programs within the District.

On June 12, 1974, the League of Women Voters of Seattle expressed concern to the Seattle School Board that the vigorous beginning to school desegregation in Seattle had lost its momentum. References were made to the need to build up the enrollment at Garfield High School by methods which would increase racial integration. The League proposed a "magnet" school concept for Garfield, one which would attract and satisfy the needs of an integrated enrollment, and urged that the plan adopted for Garfield take into account the academic and vocational needs of the variety of students within the attendance area, and that adequate funding be assured to carry on the program for a reasonable period of time.

Philip Swain presented a resolution on desegregation on behalf of a committee of the Board comprising Mrs. Sutton, Mr. Gayton, and himself. They had received a charge at the Board meeting of June 5, 1974, to bring their colleagues a resolution reaffirming and updating the commitment of the Seattle School District to desegregation of the educational program for young people in the Seattle area. He pointed out that the resolution essentially accomplished two things: 1) it affirmed the District's long standing commitments to desegregation and several cases made prior to the majority of the present membership of the Board having been involved; it was an important reaffirmation and involvement of people who were not parties to some of the original decisions; 2) in addition, it focused in on some of the shorter term actions of the coming two school years that the committee saw and recommended as particularly important if the District were to move forward in giving effect to those longer range goals. The committee was ready to answer questions from other Board members and he urged that time enough be retained for full review and discussion of this resolution. He expressed the personal hope that the end product of that review and discussion might be action on this resolution. The resolution stated the Board's intention to desegregate Garfield High School in September, 1975. Desegregation was to be achieved by eliminating all transfers granted to students after June, 1975, who were not participating in the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, and who were residents of the Garfield Attendance Area, and by adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries. The Board anticipated the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district. The resolution is given here in full:

RESOLUTION NO. 1974-14

WHEREAS, the Board has studied the administrative reports entitled "Preliminary Report Desegregation Planning Tulsa Public Schools" and "Recommendation of the Instruction Division for the Further Desegregation of Seattle Public Schools" and endorses the general concepts and planning recommendations in those reports; and

WHEREAS, the Board has adopted as its goal on Affirmative Action Program of recruiting, hiring and placing staffs in every department in every school and at every level of operation with proportions of racial minority to total employees corresponding to the proportions of racial minority students to total students in the entire school system; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle School District has for a number of years worked to improve ethnic balance in the schools and provide a degree of multiethnic educational environment for all children during their educational careers; and

WHEREAS, the voluntary program has provided several thousand students the opportunity to attend multi-ethnic classes during the past several years; and

WHEREAS, the District has a mandatory reassignment program in effect at the middle schools in the Lincoln-Roosevelt-Garfield areas; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle School Board reaffirms its policy to work toward desegregation by whatever just, reasonable and educationally sound means are available to us; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. Garfield High School shall be desegregated with the beginning of the 1975-76 school year. Desegregation shall be accomplished by the elimination of all transfers granted to students who would normally graduate from high school after June, 1975, who are not participating in the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, and who are residents of the Garfield attendance area; by adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries; and by the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district.

2. The District shall commit and allocate resources to other multi-ethnic and multi-cultural secondary schools to maintain and enhance their drawing power and academic excellence.

3. Every school that is de facto segregated shall, during the 1974-75 school year, be paired with a school without a significant minority enrollment.

   The paired schools will develop frequent informal contacts between the two staffs, student bodies and parent groups. Planning for the 1975-76 school year shall include multi-ethnic and multi-cultural exchanges involving teachers, students and families, shared educational experiences such as assemblies, field trips and short-term and long-term student transfers.

4. The District shall initiate immediately a boundary realignment study for those schools that are de facto segregated to determine the effect on the racial composition of school attendance areas of redrawing boundaries for 1975-76 with a conscious attempt to bring about a better ethnic balance.

5. The District's commitment to the Voluntary Transfer Program is reaffirmed. Support will be provided to make it of maximum effectiveness.

6. The administration is directed to provide and integrate resources to carry out the concepts and recommendations in the administrative reports including attention to facilities consolidation and upgrading, planning, transportation patterns, multi-ethnic staffing, staff preparation, student assignment, transfer policies and placement procedures, necessary funding, community involvement, etc. An operational plan incorporating those elements is to be presented for Board consideration and subsequent approval by September 1, 1974.

Adopted this 12th day of June, 1974.

On August 20, 1975, Resolution 1974-14 was amended as follows:

> "Those students who will be seniors in the 1975-76 school year and who were not granted written one-year exemptions from Garfield for the 1974-75 school year may, in accordance with School District policy, apply for an exemption from assignment to Garfield to complete their senior year in the school to which they were previously assigned.
>
> Each such application may be based only on the grounds of (a) activities, or (b) special courses in which the applicant is involved. Each such case is subject to a review and approval by the superintendent's designee."

On September 3, 1974, Mike Hickey, Associate Superintendent, Instruction Division, set forth the Operational Plan for School Desegregation, 1974-75.[43] The Plan was presented to the Board on September 11, 1974. The fifteen-page document is spread on the minutes of that date, and contains detailed, operational statements of intent to implement the Board's policy. The Operational Plan, therefore, is the document that interprets Board policy in concrete, detailed terms. The Plan focused on the following major program areas:

1. Desegregation of Garfield High School
2. Multi-ethnic/multi-cultural secondary schools
3. Paired schools program
4. Boundary realignment study
5. Voluntary transfer program.

The Plan was followed on March 3, 1975, with a Mid-Year Progress Report on the Implementation of School Desegregation Plan, 1975-76.[44] The Mid-Year Progress Report stated that, with a few minor exceptions, the activities set forth in the earlier plan were occurring as projected and within anticipated schedules. Embodied in the report are summaries of major activities in each of the program areas addressed in the Operational Plan.

1. Garfield High School. Resolution 1974-14 identified three strategies to be utilized in the desegregation of Garfield High School. The first one called for the elimination of all transfers granted to students residing in the district, with exceptions noted in the amendment of August 20, 1975. This effort was about 50% successful, according to a statement by Jim Page, Advisory Specialist for Desegregation.[45] Page stated that the discrepancy between White and Black enrollment was narrowed by approximately 18%. The second strategy called for adjusting the Garfield attendance area boundaries. The Boundary Realignment Study revealed that this strategy to desegregate Garfield was not feasible. Enlarging the Garfield attendance boundaries would result in overcrowding at Garfield, and underutilization of facilities adjacent to Garfield.

   The third strategy called for the development at Garfield of exemplary academic and occupational programs designed to attract students from the entire district. Dr. Hal Reasby, Deputy Superintendent for Region I, has outlined the methods by which this will be achieved in the Preliminary Planning Document III, 1975-76: An Operational Plan for Development of Garfield High School as an Innovative, Exemplary, and Comprehensive High School.[46] The Planning Document states the goals, objectives, and tasks to be accomplished along with the lines of responsibility needed to develop exemplary academic and occupational programs at Garfield.

2. Multi-ethnic/Multi-cultural Secondary Schools. In the early planning (c. 1970) for the District efforts for desegregation, it was determined that the schools in the South East area of the city already had a desirable racial balance. Six secondary schools were identified as "multi-ethnic/multi-cultural secondary schools". These schools were: Cleveland, Franklin, Mercer, Rainier Beach, Sharples, (and South Shore). A decision was therefore made that efforts and resources should be assigned to stabilize the existing racial balance and to enhance the programs in those schools. Therefore, no effort was made to change the assignment of students in these attendance areas to other schools.

   Resources were assigned to each of the schools to develop projects in the following areas: 1) special staffing needs to improve staff ethnic representation, 2) enrichment of curricular programs, 3) staff development and training programs, 4) student activity programs, and 5) specialized bilingual and multi-cultural programs.

3. Paired Schools Programs. A third major emphasis of School Board Resolution 1974-14 directed integration efforts in Region II toward reducing the effects of racial isolation through concentrating on a Paired School model for elementary-age students and additional funding for multi-racial secondary schools. For 1975-76, the paired schools approach becomes just one of many suggested activities that school staffs might adopt, but it is not structured for sixteen schools as in 1974-75.

Minority isolated and non-isolated schools are matched, and cooperative arrangements are developed between paired schools so that minority and non-minority students, teachers, and parents may have opportunities to get to know one another and to share experiences which assist in developing understanding of ethnicity and cultural pluralism.

4. Boundary Realignment. Jim Page, Advisory Specialist for Desegregation, stated that the possibility of boundary realignment was studied as a possible vehicle for desegregation and then sidelined because of apparent weaknesses as a major desegregation tool.[47]

5. Voluntary Transfer Program. The Voluntary Racial Transfer Program was initiated by the School Board in the fall of 1963. It was the District's initial effort to reduce racial imbalance in the Seattle Schools. The VRT program has, in the main, been a one-way program in which black students transferred out of Central Area schools to majority-white schools. This program, which had 247 students participating in 1963, reached its peak in 1969-70 when the VRT enrollment was 2,600 (black 2,200 - white 400). This year, 1975-76, there are 1,476 voluntary transfer students (black 1,109 - white 349 - other 18). Included in the enrollment count from 1965 to 1971 were approximately 350 students from Mann, Leschi and Summit, who were mandatorily assigned to north end schools under a building utilization program.

   The program provides free bus transportation to and from school and human relations programs and activities in a number of schools which are receiving VRT students.

Title VII Funding Controversy

The Seattle School District received notification on June 12, 1975 that Title VII (Emergency School Aid Act) funding which supported a basic skills program, the Ethnic Cultural Heritage program, and Project Bridge would be withdrawn, because of alleged failure on the part of the District to comply with provisions for assuring special instruction to students whose education is hampered by limited English speaking ability, and for practicing racial discrimination in placing racial minority teachers disproportionately in schools with substantial enrollments of minority students. In addition, the Office of Civil Rights has commenced administrative enforcement proceedings against the District under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The charges involved are the same as the Title VII issues--service to students with limited speaking ability and minority staffing distribution. The District has responded that the Office of Civil Rights should await the findings of the Court in the ESAA suit filed by the District in July before proceeding under Title VI. OCR contends, however, that the ESAA issue and Title VI enforcement are separate matters and that they are required by law to continue their efforts to terminate all federal assistance to the District (about $7 million annually) unless the District agrees to their prescribed corrective actions. Resolution of this issue awaits the decision of the court as it relates to ESAA Title VII funding. The District is involved in administrative efforts to resolve the concerns of the Office of Civil Rights with respect to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION NO. 1971-3
CONCERNING DESEGREGATION AND INTEGRATION OF SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1

WHEREAS, the Constitution of the State of Washington maintains that education is the paramount duty of the State; and

WHEREAS, the administration of the public school system of this district is vested in the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1; and

WHEREAS, the United States of America, the State of Washington, and the City of Seattle constitute a multiracial society, and the success of this society depends upon the mutual respect and understanding which are fostered in the public school system; and

WHEREAS, significant educational research has indicated the detrimental effect that racial isolation has on educational achievement; and

WHEREAS, this research has also indicated the positive effect of integrated education on children from racial or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups; and

WHEREAS, we, the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1 have found that the best interest of the children of Seattle School District No. 1 will be served by providing all school children with a quality multiracial education; and

WHEREAS, since 1963 the Seattle School Board has moved in every feasible and educationally sound way toward integration of Seattle school children, and despite these efforts de facto segregation and resultant racial isolation have increased;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Seattle School District No. 1 instructs the administration to implement the desegregation plan as hereinafter outlined:

1. Grades 5-8 in the Lincoln, Roosevelt and Meany-Madrona attendance areas are to be integrated by the exchange of approximately 600 grade 5-8 students from the Lincoln-Roosevelt area to the Meany-Madrona Middle School and approximately 600 Meany-Madrona area students to the Lincoln-Roosevelt area schools.

2. Transportation is to be made available to the approximately 1,200 students in this program.

3. Continuous progress education including individualized instruction in the basic subjects and a wide diversity of special interest programs including advanced courses, creative arts and environmental education is to be a part of the curriculum for the middle schools.

4. The administration is to assure that these middle schools will be staffed with principals, teachers, and others who will provide the educational and human relations leadership which is required and who desire to work in the integrated school and who will take part in programs for individualized instruction, continuous progress, and multiracial education.

5. The administration is to establish a planning steering committee made up of representatives of the Central Area School Council and of the interim advisory councils of the Roosevelt and Lincoln areas pending formation of elected councils in these two areas. Membership on this steering committee should also include liaison persons from the Citizens Committee for Quality Education. This steering committee will work closely with the chief planners in developing and achieving overall planning objectives. In addition, means for parent, teacher, and student involvement in each of the planning task forces will be worked out. The administration is directed to provide within two weeks a system for such participation. It is the School Board's wish that there be as much community participation as possible in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the plan.

6. Insofar as is feasible, the exchange plan will adhere to the following organization:

   Lincoln-Roosevelt areas

   1. Eckstein, Hamilton, and Wilson will be grades 6-8 middle schools.

   2. Marshall will be grades 9-12 satellite of Roosevelt. Special Education programs will continue at Marshall.

   3. Marshall 1970-71 grade 7 (1971-72 grade 8) students will be distributed between Eckstein and Hamilton.

   4. Interlake will be a 9-12 satellite of Lincoln.

   5. All elementary feeders will be K-5.

   6. Students (K-5) from Interlake will be distributed among Day, Latona, and McDonald.

   Meany-Madrona Area

   1. Meany will continue as a grade 7-8 middle school. Madrona will continue as a grade 5-6 middle school component of the Meany-Madrona grade 5-8 middle school complex. Leschi, Lowell. McGilvra, Minor, Montlake, Seward, and Stevens will be K-4 feeders to Madrona which along with Colman and Gatzert will feed Meany.

2. Meany in turn will continue to feed the Garfield-Washington grade 9-12 complex which will continue to be a comprehensive high school. Harrison will remain a K-2 primary school. Colman and Gatzert will remain K-6 feeders to Meany.

   Fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students who are assigned for the 1971-72 school year will be chosen from contiguous geographic regions from the elementary attendance area within which they reside. Some students will be reassigned from the following elementary attendance areas:

   B.F. Day - McDonald
   Bagley - Olympic View
   Bryant - Laurelhurst - Sand Point - University Heights
   Leschi - Lowell - McGilvra - Minor - Montlake - Seward -Stevens - and the former Mann, Summit, and Madrona attendance areas.

Adopted by the Seattle School Board, January 27, 1971.

APPENDIX B

RESOLUTION NUMBER 1973-4

WHEREAS, the Seattle School Board has recognized the negative educational effects of racial isolation within schools and has publicly indicated its commitment to eliminate such isolation utilizing whatever just, reasonable, and educationally sound means are available; and

WHEREAS, the Board has demonstrated this commitment through a variety of means, including the Phase I Middle School desegregation, the Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, the South Region Voluntary Pairing Program, inter-District transfer efforts with Bellevue and Mercer Island School Districts, minority staffing efforts, and human relations training programs for teachers, parents, students; and

WHEREAS, the Board views the recommendation of January 12, 1973, from the administration on utilizing Title VII, Emergency School Aid Act funds as the means of establishing the program base, staff training, and voluntary participation commitment necessary for further expansion of the Board's previous efforts;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board considers the aforementioned efforts as the natural extension and intensification of its overall effort toward eliminating, reducing, and remediating the effects of minority group isolation within the Seattle Public Schools, as set forth in its statement of January 27, 1971, and approves the following timeline for continuation of its desegregation efforts:

a) Continue Phase I activities in the Roosevelt-Lincoln-Garfield attendance areas during 1973-74;

b) Continue to actively solicit participants in the District-Wide Voluntary Racial Transfer Program, with active support from C.Q.I.E. and other interested and school groups, during 1973-74;

c) Continue and expand programs for staff, community and student training on multiethnic awareness and human relations awareness, with substantial increases in service to South Region schools, including (as funding permits) cooperatively planned and executed projects between minority isolated and nonisolated schools during 1973-74;

d) Increasing the District's efforts to remediate Basic Skills deficits which may exist in low-income and isolated schools so achievement differentials between students from exchanging schools will not hamper efforts toward eliminating racial isolation, during 1973-74;

e) Conducting a greatly expanded and intensified campaign to recruit voluntary transfers between minority isolated and non-isolated schools during the Spring quarter of the 1973-74 school year;

f) Encouraging the return of nonminority Central Area residents and voluntary transfer of other nonminority students to Central Area schools to reestablish attendance patterns that reflect residential statistics, thereby eliminating minority isolation at Central Region schools during 1973-74;

g) Eliminating or reducing by 10%, the minority isolation (as defined by ESAA Title VII) at half of the 1973-74 "isolated" South Region schools as a result of voluntary transferring recruited by the programs and the recruitment campaigns operated during 1973-74 for school year 1974-75;

h) Reassess the efficacy of the various strategies to reduce and eliminate minority group isolation and determine the most feasible procedures for completely eliminating minority group isolation for 1975-76 school year, during 1974-75.

Adopted this 11th day of April, 1973.

NOTES

1. Report of the Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning, Seattle Public Schools, February, 1972, pp. 12-13.

2. Board Minutes, Seattle School District, Nov. 11, 1970.

3. "CAMB Sues to Push Recall," Seattle Times, Feb. 11, 1971.

4. "Recall Charges Against School Board 'Not Valid'; Seattle Post Intelligencer, Feb. 27, 1971.

5. Board Minutes, Seattle School District, Jan. 27, 1971.

6. Citizens Committee for Quality Education, Planning Recommendations for Cultural and Structural Integration of the Seattle Public Schools, Final Report, June, 1971.

7. "Judge Halts Desegregation Plans," Seattle Times, Aug. 10, 1971.

8. "STA Official Asks for Orderly Opening," Seattle Post Intelligencer, August 11, 1971.

9. "Nixon In No-Bussing Ultimatum," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Aug. 11, 1971.

10. "Free School Breakfasts?" Seattle Post Intelligencer, Aug. 27, 1971.

11. "CAMB Endorses Three in School Board Race," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Sept. 3, 1971.

12. "Refusal to Build at Garfield is Cited," Seattle Times, Sept. 1, 1971.

13. "New Principal Named at Eckstein School," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Sept. 28, 1971.

14. "700 Eckstein Parents Air Discontent," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Oct. 5, 1971.

15. "'Board Must Admit' Eckstein Failures," Seattle Times, Oct. 14, 1971.

16. "Causes of Lincoln Unrest Are Listed," Seattle Post Intelligencer, Oct. 20, 1971.

17. Letter to Editor, *Seattle Times*, Oct. 21, 1971.

18. "Nickerson Hits Middle School Plan," *Seattle Times*, Oct. 26, 1971.

19. "Cross Burned at Home in Bellevue," *Seattle Times*, Oct. 28, 1971.

20. "Purpose of School Key Issue in Palmason-Chafe Race," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Oct. 29, 1971.

21. "School Plans to be Debated," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Dec. 14, 1971.

22. "Small Crowd Generates Heat at Bussing Hearing," *Seattle Times*, Dec. 14, 1971.

23. "State High Court OK's School Recall Petitions," *Seattle Times*, Jan. 6, 1972.

24. "Cowles Defends Central Area Post," *Seattle Times*, Jan. 6, 1972.

25. "High Court Hears Seattle Board's Bussing Appeal," *Seattle Times*, Jan. 12, 1972.

26. "School Board Members Vow Readiness to Ask Recall," *Seattle Times*, Jan. 13, 1972.

27. "Senate Strips Courts of Power to Order Bussing," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 25, 1972.

28. "Three Court Rulings Made Bussing a National Issue," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 27, 1972.

29. "High Court to Rule on School Bussing," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Jan. 18, 1972.

30. *Report of the Superintendent's Task Force on Desegregation Planning*, Seattle Public Schools, February, 1972.

31. "Report Would End Voluntary Transfers," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 27, 1972.

32. "School Board Split on Desegregation, 4-3," *Seattle Times*, March 23, 1972.

33. "Vote All But Cuts Out Fall Bussing," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, March 23, 1972.

34. "Tidwell Quits School Board in Frustration," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, March 30, 1972.

35. "High Court's Ruling on School Bussing," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, April 7, 1972.

36. "Synopses of School Board Recall Ballots," *Seattle Times*, April 7, 1972.

37. "Bottomly says 'Go' on Mandatory Plan," *Seattle Times*, April 7, 1972.

38. *Board Minutes*, Seattle School District, April 12, 1972.

39. *Abstract, Middle Schools in Perspective*, Seattle Public Schools, 1973, p. 7.

40. "67 Members of Advisory Councils Back Action," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 2, 1973.

41. "Recall Failing, Levy Defeated," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, Feb. 7, 1973.

42. Mike Hickey, *Recommendations of the Instructional Division for the Further Desegregation of Seattle Public Schools*, April 22, 1974.

43. Seattle Public Schools Instruction Division, *Operational Plan for School Desegregation, 1974-75*, 15 pp.

44. Mike Hickey memorandum to Loren Troxel, March 3, 1975, *Mid-Year Progress Report: Implementation of School Desegregation Plan, 1974-75*, 16 pp.

45. Jim Page, Memorandum to Dr. Consuelo Shaw, Oct. 20, 1975.

46. Hal Reasby, *Preliminary Planning Document III, 1975-76: An Operational Plan for Development of Garfield High School as an Innovative, Exemplary, and Comprehensive High School, Year III*, 21 pp.

47. Jim Page, op. cit.